

SENATE—Monday, May 19, 1986

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

God be merciful unto us, and bless us; and cause his face to shine upon us; that thy way may be known upon earth, thy saving health among all nations. Let the people praise thee, O God; let all the people praise thee. O let the nations be glad and sing for joy; for thou shall judge the people righteously and govern the nations upon earth.—Psalms 67:1-4.

God of mercy, so easily we become spiritually disoriented. We drift without an anchor. Losing our magnetic north we wander without direction and purpose. Help us return to Thee O God that we may connect with our spiritual and moral roots. For the sake of our stewardship as national leaders and for Your glory. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able majority leader, Senator DOLE, is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, under the standing order, the leaders will have 10 minutes each, followed by special orders in favor of Senators HAWKINS, MATTINGLY, and PROXMIER—the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, Senator THURMOND, is scheduled to deliver the Hawkins special order—and routine morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 1 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for not more than 5 minutes each.

Following routine morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 2180, the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act. No votes will occur prior to the hour of 3 p.m., and no votes will occur after the hour of 6 p.m. today.

There will be a number of votes, I would assume, on Tuesday and Wednesday. We hope to begin consideration of H.R. 4515, the supplemental appropriations bill later today or early tomorrow. There will be votes on that throughout Tuesday and we could be asked to remain in late on Tuesday or Wednesday to complete action on the supplemental.

As previously agreed to some time ago, we will be in adjournment for the Memorial Day recess until Monday, June 2. That will start effective the close of business Wednesday, May 21. On June 2, we will convene at 2 p.m. rather than 12 noon. We will do that by consent.

It is still our intention to call up the tax reform bill very early upon our return. I met with the Budget Committee chairman hoping we could expedite consideration of a 303 wavier request so we would be prepared to start on the tax bill, if not on Monday, June 2, on Tuesday, June 3, or no later than Wednesday, June 4.

There will also probably be pending at that time the President's veto of the resolution of disapproval of the Saudi arms sale. I am not certain when that veto will occur, but that will be pending, I assume, when we return, unless disposed of before we leave.

I would suggest to my colleagues that June 2 is also the first day of public televising of Senate proceedings. We will, as I said, begin on that day at 2 o'clock.

YELENA BONNER'S CALL FOR PEACE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, yesterday the Washington Post's Outlook section ran an article written by Yelena Bonner, Soviet dissident and wife of Andrei Sakharov. Her message was simple and straightforward: Americans want peace. They want the freedom to live in their own homes, raise their families, pursue their careers. They do not want war. They want peace.

Yelena Bonner, who has been in the West for the past 5 months being treated for medical problems, recognized two overriding American characteristics—the desire for privacy and independence. These are traits the Soviet system does not accommodate.

As she points out, at the age of 63, she has never had a house, and probably never will:

My dream, my own house, is unattainable for me and my family—that is for my husband and myself, as unattainable as Heaven on Earth.

Why so unattainable? Because she and her husband had the audacity to challenge the Soviet Government, to speak out against its abuses, and to dare to ask to leave. But even if they hadn't, the opportunity for something as basic as owning your own home in the Soviet Union is as rare as a 5-percent mortgage rate in the United States. But then, so are other basics, like the freedom of speech, the free-

dom of movement, the freedom of religion.

Mrs. Bonner is getting ready to leave the United States, to return to her husband and their life in internal exile. Mrs. Bonner has whiffed the winds of freedom, she has exulted in the homely pleasures of family life in American suburbia; she has bathed in the warmth and beauty of a Caribbean beach; she has lived in an open and democratic society.

It is ironic, that just as she was preparing to return to a closed life in the closed city of Gorky, Anatoly Shcharansky, the recently freed Soviet dissident, was beginning his first trip to the United States. For those of us who had the pleasure and honor to meet with Mr. Shcharansky, his joy at being free was patently obvious, even after a grueling schedule.

But at the same time, he made it very clear that while enjoying his new life in Israel, he will relentlessly campaign for the right of the 400,000 Soviet Jews who wish to emigrate, and for the thousands of dissidents who remain in Soviet prison camps.

Mrs. Bonner, Mr. Shcharansky, and all Soviets held against their will, want something as basic as a house and as awesome as freedom and peace.

As Mrs. Bonner wrote:

I want a house. I don't want war. Americans want a house, too. Americans don't want war.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include the text of Mrs. Bonner's remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICANS DON'T WANT WAR—THEY WANT HOUSES, WITH YARDS, AND SO DO I

(By Yelena Bonner)

(Yelena Bonner plans to leave the United States Saturday to return to the Soviet Union and life in internal exile with her husband and fellow dissident, Andrei Sakharov.)

I am convinced that Americans want peace. I don't know about America—I'm not a specialist, like the schoolchildren who travel around the world on peace missions and can explain everything about rockets and so on. But while I am not as competent to judge, I maintain that Americans do not want war.

What Americans want is a house. No matter their place on the social ladder, their salary, capital, inheritance, winnings in the lottery or on the stock market (for me with my lack of education in these matters it is almost one and the same, even though I do know that people win more frequently—and lose more frequently!—playing the stock market than the lottery), they want a house of their own.

They want a house and the ground it stands on, and a surrounding bit of land. That's all. Some own a tiny house, like a toy cottage, and the only soil is in their flower boxes; others have lots of bedrooms, baths, and extensive lawns. The desire to own a house is not a class ambition; it encompasses upper, middle, upper-middle, or lower-income groups, and is an expression of a national trait, a desire for privacy.

Even one of New York's homeless, huddling in a blanket over a grating, will be insulted if you invade his privacy. A house is the symbol of independence, not even a material one, but some sort of combined spiritual and physical independence. The American feeling about his house expresses the main traits of Americans—the desire for privacy and independence. But that attitude gives rise to a third trait, "my house is my pride and joy."

And from that comes "My city, my state, my country is my pride and joy." There is no aggression or parochialism in that attitude. It is open and kind and caring both toward the house and toward everything that it stands for, the soil in the flower boxes and the lovingly-tended lawn, even if it's only three yards square. And, I say, this shows that Americans care about land in general and about the whole world. Only the other day my son told me that according to a poll, 43 percent of all Americans prefer growing flowers to any other outdoor pastime.

Americans do not want war. They want a house. The first lady says that when the president retires, they will sell the house in which they lived before the presidency. The children are grown and the place is too big for them, so they will buy a smaller house. A wonderful plan! And it's wonderful that the whole country knows it. The president doesn't want war, he wants a new house.

I also want a house, in addition to my usual wants that everyone be together and healthy and that there be no war. With enough land around it, and no more, for me to plant flowers. For the sake of nostalgia I could grow an ordinary Russian cornflower and an ordinary Russian daisy and a single birch tree. But to tell the truth, I find nostalgia a form of play acting.

I don't need a lot of bedrooms, just one for us and one for mother, a guest room and one more so that I'm always ready for our grandchildren. And I'd like a room where I could at last spread out my books and where Andrei could make a mess. What nonsense I'm writing! I want a house! This is me, who should be counting the days, no, the hours of my freedom to do what I want, even to type this freely, to type all my unattainable nonsense, such as "I want a house."

But you know, I'm sixty-three, and I've never had a house; not only that, I've never had a corner I could call my own. I started out like everyone else: a normal childhood, but then came a strange orphanhood—father and mother arrested and no one knowing whether they were alive or not. I lived in a single room with my grandmother, brother and sister. On the other side of the wall (we could hear everything) lived a man named Fyodorov with his wife and four children. When he got drunk he beat them. If they managed to get away, they would spend the night with us, sitting on the old trunk. Fyodorov never broke into our room. He was afraid of grandmother—everyone was afraid of her except me. I had my own fears, of course, but ever since my parents' arrest, I have never allowed myself to show my dread of anything.

Then there was the army. I guess there was a time when my "house" was a compartment in the hospital train, where I was head nurse. The war ended, and many people shared my room with me, like girl friends in Leningrad after the evacuation was over. Later, we had a room in a communal apartment—my first husband, two children, my mother, and I; often we had friends staying the night. There were 48 people in one apartment, and one toilet.

Later in Moscow, we had two rooms in the apartment where my mother, the children and I lived, and then we were joined by my son-in-law, and then by Sakharov. I think that the first time I was mistress of my own place was—it's hard to believe—in Gorky, in exile.

I do not want that. I want a house. My daughter has a house in Newton, Mass. It makes me so happy to think that she has a house. Her family is caught up in our affairs, in our Gorky horrors and suffering, and our cares. They have forgotten the pleasure of their house. I want them to go back to caring about it. It has done so much for them—my daughter and her husband and their two children have been living in the house since their arrival in 1977. My son came there, followed by his wife, and their daughter was born there. Two families shared the house in a most un-American way—it was almost a communal apartment and it had almost a third family: my mother arrived and the impossibility of going back to Russia has kept her there close to six years. Where else could she go—to live in exile in Gorky?

My dream, my own house, is unattainable for me and my family—that is, for my husband and myself, as unattainable as heaven on earth. But I want a house. If not for me, then for my son and his family. My son and I plan to buy one. And I am learning many new things. The house should be near good schools, my granddaughter is three and schooling is not far off in the future. It should be in the suburbs—vacations are short and a child should not have to grow up in a polluted city. It should be close to their work—both parents have jobs and there is only one car. It should have a full foundation and basement (I had never known such considerations to exist). It should have three bedrooms so that my mother can be with them, or at least visit. It should have a room and bath in the basement for guests. It should have a studio—Alyosha wants more than a house, he needs a workshop for his mathematics. But the cost is . . . oh! I want, I want, I want. More than the children, I want. But it's time for me to pack my bags. Not tomorrow, but very soon. The children live here. I live over there.

My time here has been a highlight of my entire life. For instance, I went to the Virgin Islands, I had never been in a climate like that, near palm trees—coconuts really do fall! My bare feet had never felt sand like this. The warm and quiet sea splashed just twenty steps away from me. I would call it paradise, but paradise is not simply a question of climate, or sand, or sea, or even apples (or pears—that historical argument from the Garden of Eden has yet to be solved). Paradise is being with people you love and treasure and not worrying about them. I wish Andrei were here. I wish my mother could sit in a rocker in the shade near those sweet, sleep-inducing oleanders, and I wish I could pick up the phone once a week and hear the calm voices of my children. Paradise, it turns out, is so simple and, it turns out, unattainable for me.

Long, hot hours on the white, hot sand; the sea—light blue, dark blue, turquoise. The bay is small—even with my ailing legs I managed to wander all the way to its left point one day, and to its right on another. I will always remember that arc, a smooth edge of sand, and the sea, which doesn't roar, but whispers, babbles. I'm afraid of lapsing into sentimentality (I think I already have, in fact), but I've never seen such a sea . . . it has such tranquility.

Perhaps I have grown more tranquil here. I am grateful that I was invited to that island and that it was so simple to give me five days to catch my breath, to work, and to have peace. Maybe those days let me regain my senses—to stop losing my temper with my family; to understand that I can change nothing or correct nothing; to stop tormenting my heart (the six bypasses may not be able to take it) and the hearts of others—hearts I love.

My husband told me just five months ago (God, I haven't seen him in five months and want to be with him so much!), "The world is further away from war than it has been in a long time." I believe him, and on that score, I live calmly. Especially since I have more than enough worries, cares, and misfortunes of my own.

What difference does it make if Gorbachev and Reagan meet in June or some other month? What difference does it make which of them is being cranky? First Gorbachev plays hard to get, like a girl invited for a date, pouting, considering: "I don't know, I have to think about it, probably not." Then Reagan sounds like a jealous girl, "It's her or me. Now or never." A recent newspaper article set me thinking along these lines. Actually, all three are alien to me—the newspaper and the two governments. I must be one of the world's least interested people in the problems that Reagan and Gorbachev are threatening to discuss or not discuss, when and if they meet or don't meet.

I want a house. I don't want war. Americans want a house, too. Americans don't want war.

So now with my surgically repaired organ of feelings and circulation I am writing in a hotel in New York, which is simultaneously a city and a country and a world. I am on the eighth floor in a corner room. One window opens on 61st Street, the other on Central Park. In two directions, unfolding from an angle, stretches a panorama that needs nothing added to it. Against the blue of the sky are the gray silhouettes of buildings that pierce it (light gray in the sun, darker in shadow), lines, lines, lines. How can anyone say that New York is not beautiful? For me it is the city of cities, ready for the future.

Today I say something amazing from the windows of this room.

I got up early, a bit after six. The haze of burgeoning buds barely showed over the trees, and the grass had not yet taken on a greenish hue. It was still yellow, the color of grass shoots. And now it's noon, and there is a delicate green smoke over the trees and the grass has turned green, a tender, tender green. So quickly, spring came in six hours. Lord, I want the whole world to feel this good. They say New York is at its best in springtime. And now I'm going downstairs into the city.

THE SPECIAL OLYMPICS AIRLIFT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, each year the National Aeronautic Association is presented to an individual or company for the greatest achievements in aeronautics and astronautics in America.

This past Friday evening the Collier Trophy for 1985 was presented to Cessna Aircraft Co. and its chairman, Russell Meyer, for the safety record in 1985 of the worldwide fleet of Cessna Citation business jet aircraft. In 1985, for the second successive year, no passenger fatalities were recorded during nearly 750,000 flight hours by the fleet of almost 1,400 Citations in more than 40 countries worldwide. Cessna is the first general aviation recipient of the Collier Trophy since its inception in 1911.

At the awards ceremonies Friday evening, Russ Meyer and Eunice Kennedy Shriver, chairman of Special Olympics International, made a surprise announcement of the "Citation Special Olympics Airlift," the details of which I would like to share with my colleagues. The airlift program provides that each U.S. athlete, coach, and official delegate to the 1987 International Summer Special Olympics games will be flown to South Bend, IN, in a giant airlift of Cessna Citation business jets organized and sponsored by Cessna Aircraft Co.

Cessna will ask more than 700 corporate owners of Cessna Citations in the United States to fly special olympians to the summer games in their Citations. This effort will require at least 500 Citations for a minimum of 2 days each—to transport athletes to the games and to take them home 10 days later. This program will save the Special Olympics more than \$2 million in transportation costs. In his announcement Friday, Meyer indicated that of the hundred or so Citation owners he had contacted about this, the positive response was unanimous. I'm sure that when the rest of the Citation owners are contacted, the 500 planes necessary for a successful operation will have been procured.

This is a great example of corporate America doing its share to help great programs like the Special Olympics. The "Citation Special Olympics Airlift" is a program of staggering dimensions, and the only way to bring it into perspective is to compare it to the Berlin airlift. At its peak, we had 120 flights per day into Berlin. In July 1987, there will be more than 600 flights into South Bend, IN. There will be a Citation landing in South Bend every 80 to 90 seconds for a period of 14 to 15 hours.

Mr. President, I congratulate Russ Meyer, Cessna, and the Special Olympics on the announcement of this Special Olympics airlift. And special congratulations to Russ Meyer for being

the 1985 recipient of the Collier Trophy.

AMERICA WILL MISS THEODORE H. WHITE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, last week America lost one of her most distinguished historians with the passing of Theodore H. White. He was a gifted writer and reporter, but above all, he was unique in his ability to convey history with an intimacy and relevance that made spellbinding reading to every kind of audience.

As a foreign correspondent, "Teddy" White blazed new trails for American writers with his pioneering coverage of the dramatic days of revolution in Red China during the 1930's. His book "Thunder Out of China" has become the foundation on which any serious study of that country must begin. But after extensive writings from foreign shores, the lure of politics brought Teddy to a new and highly visible role as the journalistic dean of American Presidential campaigns.

His popular series "The Making of the President" is a landmark in historical writing because it captures the coast-to-coast detail of the world's greatest democracy electing its leader: from the campaign trail, to the back rooms of the convention hall, to inaugural day itself, Teddy White has given us an eyewitness account that will stand forever as living American history. His brand of Presidential journalism is still the model for today's writers, which tells you plenty about this great American storyteller.

Mr. President, many of us in this Chamber knew Theodore White well and we will miss his special presence on Capitol Hill, or on the campaign trail, or wherever his nose for news took him. The Senator from Kansas extends the Senate's deepest sympathies to Mr. White's family. When the next election rolls around, we will look, by habit, for the bespectacled historian, and we will remember in sadness his passing.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH). The Democratic leader is recognized.

DEFENSE BURDEN SHARING: SOME POSITIVE DEVELOPMENTS, BUT OUR ALLIES NEED TO DO MORE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Defense Department recently issued the unclassified version of its latest annual report on Allied Contributions to the Common Defense, also known as the burden-sharing report.

This document, perhaps the best summary comparison of how well or

poorly our NATO allies and Japan are sharing the mutual security burden, is required by statutory language authored by our distinguished colleague from Michigan, Mr. LEVIN.

The latest unclassified version of the report, the 1986 edition, also contains expanded information focusing specifically on the adequacy, or lack thereof, of Japan's self-defense contributions. That information is required by an amendment I authored to last year's State Department authorization act.

There is both good news and bad news for the American taxpayer, and for U.S. national security, in this newest burden-sharing report.

The good news is that, mainly because of senatorial pressure on the executive branch, and on our allies, the NATO countries and Japan finally are taking some positive steps to increase their defense efforts and to carry a fairer share of the common security burden.

The bad news is that these steps still are clearly insufficient to relieve more of the unfair burden currently borne by U.S. taxpayers to pay for our mutual security, and that, in terms of overall average annual real growth in defense spending, the allied burden-sharing performance is getting worse instead of better.

This report refers to positive decisions by NATO to increase military construction funding, and by some of the European allies to increase their ammunition procurement. NATO also may be making progress to compensate for the impact of possible U.S. deployments to the Persian Gulf.

These developments would not have occurred without amendments by Senators SAM NUNN and CARL LEVIN to focus attention on extremely inadequate defense contributions by our NATO allies.

Unfortunately, this positive news is offset by the report's disclosure that average real growth in defense spending for all other NATO nations in 1986 is tentatively projected to be the lowest in 9 years. It is a pitifully small range, from somewhere between zero and three-tenths of 1 percent.

Furthermore, for 1985, the report states that only three to four of the European allies are expected to meet their longstanding commitment to increase their defense budgets by 3 percent each year after excluding inflation.

Regarding Japan, the good news in the report is that, unlike the first year of the two previous 5-year military improvement programs, the required first year share of the new, 1986-90 Japanese defense plan was approved and fully funds almost all major front-line equipment, combat readiness, training, and sustainability items for this initial program increment.

The bad news about Japan's defense contribution is that, once again, it ranks "last or close to last on most of the performance measures compared to ability to contribute surveyed, and thus, appears to be doing far less than its fair share."

A final verdict cannot be made yet about Japan's present and future defense performance. On the one hand, Japan seems finally to have heard the message embodied in the Byrd amendment and other congressional statements that it must increase its self-defense efforts.

On the other hand, several more years of sustained increases in annual Japanese defense budgets will be needed before that nation meets the bare minimum military capabilities to live up to its mutual security commitments, including defending its sea lanes out to 1,000 miles. Each year of the new 5-year program must be funded fully, for example.

The 1986 burden-sharing report promises that future reports required by my amendment "will monitor Japanese progress toward continuing on a realistic path to achieving its defense goals." This information should permit the American taxpayers and the Congress to assess better if Japan's actual burden-sharing performance is matching its promises. Armed with such information, Congress would be in a stronger position to legislate any actions possibly needed to encourage Japan to carry a much fairer share of the common defense burden.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may reserve the balance of my time under the order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATOR HAWKINS' SPECIAL ORDER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Florida [Mrs. HAWKINS] is recognized for not to exceed 5 minutes.

The distinguished Senator from South Carolina is recognized to read Senator HAWKINS' statement.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator HAWKINS, I wish to present the following statement.

MEXICO COULD PROFIT FROM EXAMPLE SET BY ALCOHOLICS ANONYMOUS

Mrs. HAWKINS. Mr. President, one would have hoped for a different reaction from the government of Mexico to recent charges of graft and corruption in coping with the Mexican drug traffic. The government took umbrage at statements made by various high-ranking officials of the U.S. at a Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee hearing last week. The statements contended that there is "massive corruption" at all levels of the Mexican government and until this corruption is weeded out little headway can be made in trying to combat narcotics trafficking.

Mexico's reaction was swift and sharp. The Foreign Ministry issued a statement saying Mexico "categorically rejects the accusations and calumnies" directed against it. That statement said the Mexican Ambassador to the United States had been instructed to deliver a note to the State Department protesting the "libelous and interventionist" comments by American officials at the hearing and "demanding an explanation" for them. A spokesman for the Mexican Embassy in Washington described the hearing as "biased and partial" and characterized it as "meddling in Mexican internal affairs." I think we can understand why the Mexican government would not be ecstatic about accusations they are lax in investigating and prosecuting drug traffickers. But their reaction could have been less irate, more temperate. For instance, they could ask themselves, "Is there any substance to the charges?" And finding that there is, they could also ask themselves, "Are we going to take the bull by the horns and do something to clean up our act?"

We in the United States admit that we are a major factor in the international drug problem—that we are at the top of the heap among the drug consuming nations. But there is some virtue in knowing that and accepting that and in trying to do something about it. That is in sharp contrast to Mexico, which adopts an ostrich head-in-the-sand attitude, refuses to acknowledge it has a major problem and is unwilling to take the necessary steps to solve the problem. Mexico is seduced by its own guile or intoxicated by its own arrogance. Is it possible by some strange trick of alchemy that the whole country is reeling from the psychotropic effect of its own drugs? Is Mexican society so permeated by the corrosive effect of narco-dollars that it has lost its sense of decency and justice? Has it fallen hopelessly under the spell of drug traffickers? How near is Mexico to the point spelled out by Assistant Secretary of State Elliott Abrams? He said the influence of drug traffickers on the government of Mexico may become so strong "it is hard or impossible to root it out." He solemnly warned, "It may get to be too late." We put the question to Mexico, "Is it already too late? Are you too far gone? Are you beyond help? Is there some way that we can aid you?"

Mexico could take a page from the handbook of Alcoholics Anonymous. The AA rehabilitation program begins at the point where an individual stands up and admits to the world, "I am an alcoholic." Once that admission is forthcoming, the person is on the road to recovery. Is it too much to expect of Mexico to admit that it is a major drug producing and narcotics transit country, that its police and judicial systems are riddled with corruption and traffickers engage in terror and violence on people opposed to their detestable trade. And they do so with impunity. They need not fear for consequences.

Let's face certain facts. Mexico is the top supplier of marijuana and heroin to the United States. It is a pipeline for one-third of the cocaine entering this country. We consume that hideous stuff, true. It's up to us to do something about it. But it is up to Mexico to do something about their damnable exports to us. We ship them economic and material aid, they ship us degradation and human misery. Mexican drug traffickers beat and murdered an American DEA agent. Some of those suspected of killing Enrique Camarena are in jail awaiting trial. Other suspects remain at large, although re-

ports indicate Mexican authorities know their whereabouts. One suspect is believed to have been the guest of governors of two Mexican states. Fifteen months have passed since Camarena died at the hands of his torturers. The dastardly deed against him cries for justice. Is there any justice left in Mexico or has that perished beneath the boots of the drug traffickers, ground under by their arrogance for normal rules of conduct and civility?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am very pleased to deliver this statement on behalf of the able and distinguished Senator from Florida, Senator HAWKINS.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR MATTINGLY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. MATTINGLY] is recognized for not to exceed 5 minutes.

Mr. MATTINGLY. Thank you, Mr. President.

STABILITY IN THE TAX CODE

Mr. MATTINGLY. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation designed to ensure stability in the Tax Code for individual American taxpayers, and for everyone in the private sector. This sense-of-the-Senate resolution calls for no changes in the soon-to-be-introduced Tax Code for a minimum of 5 years after the tax reform bill is signed into law.

Tax reform legislation should foster economic growth, encourage investment, create new jobs, and promote savings. And it should encourage the free enterprise system in our country. One of the main barriers to this important stability has been the constant and often conflicting changes made in the tax laws by Congress.

During this coming long debate on tax reform, and also the long debate preceding it on whether or not to have tax reform in America, one of the most common complaints I heard from taxpayers is the "uncertainty" which has resulted from continuous congressional changes in the Tax Code. These constant changes literally halt important planning and investment decisions by individuals and businesses. These changes stifle capital formation by increasing the risk of a project. They place unnecessary financial burdens on people and businesses by requiring the utilization of funds to anticipate what may happen in the future due to modifications of the Tax Code. These frequent changes place great and unnecessary burdens on small businesses by adding to the already staggering paperwork load. And the lack of stability created by all these changes confuses even the most efficient entrepreneurs in our land.

When the American people are forced to make investment, consump-

tion, and savings decisions in a constantly changing tax environment, economic growth is severely hampered.

A reduction in tax rates, a broadening of the tax base, the removal of millions of our poorest citizens from the tax rolls, and the closing of various loopholes are all necessary and important parts of tax reform. But in my view, Mr. President, just as important to tax reform, and just as integral a part of tax reform, is stability—providing an atmosphere in which economic decisions can be made without fear of change in the Tax Code.

□ 1220

In other words, the Congress should stop tinkering with the Tax Code. In my opinion, the only way to give tax reform legislation a chance to succeed in its goal of providing a tax system that is fair, simple, equitable, and growth-oriented is to allow its provisions to remain unaltered for at least 5 years.

Once this latest tax reform legislation is signed into law, the Tax Code should be left alone. Congress must get out of the tax tinkering business. The resolution that I am submitting today will pledge our resolve to achieve that goal. I urge all my colleagues to join me in this effort.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the *RECORD* at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

S. RES. 409

Whereas previous, constant, and conflicting policy changes in the tax code by the Congress make it difficult for individuals to properly plan for their future;

Whereas such constant and conflicting policy changes by the Congress retard capital formation by increasing risk;

Whereas such constant and conflicting policy changes by the Congress place undue burdens on individuals and businesses by requiring the otherwise unnecessary utilization of financial resources in anticipation of such changes and modifications;

Whereas the Internal Revenue Service is drained of limited resources in trying to adapt to such changes in the tax code, and the ensuing problems are in turn transferred to taxpayers;

Whereas one of the greatest burdens placed upon small businesses is the paperwork required to comply with the tax code, and constant changes by Congress unnecessarily compound this paperwork burden;

Whereas any tax reform legislation passed by the Congress should stimulate economic growth, encourage investment, promote capital formation, expand job opportunities, and encourage savings; and

Whereas the American taxpayer deserves certainty in the tax treatment of economic decisions: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the tax reform legislation, when that bill is signed into law, remain unchanged for a minimum of five years, so as to provide stability for the American taxpayer and the private sector.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll. The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

□ 1230

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] is recognized for not to exceed 5 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Chair.

"CHALLENGER" AND CHERNOBYL TELL US STAR WARS IS DOOMED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in the last few months we have been reminded of how fragile, how subject to tragic error, is our modern space and nuclear technology. A couple of months ago, we suffered the heartbreaking shuttle disaster. Seven gallant astronauts perished. Since then NASA has endured a series of blowup, blowout failures with other space vehicles. Then, more recently, the Soviet nuclear plant near Kiev went through a meltdown with the expulsion of radioactive pollution that endangered the life and health of Russians and residents of other European countries. We live with the eerie realization that such a nuclear utility disaster could occur whenever nuclear energy is generated.

The space and nuclear disasters should warn us of how utterly unrealistic it would be for this country to rely on a nuclear-space defense such as the strategic defense initiative or star wars. Star wars would have not one or two or three components any one of which could easily fail. It would have literally thousands of interdependent components. It would be coordinated by a gigantic computer directed system. What are the odds that somewhere, sometime, somehow, such a system that required timing to the millisecond with literally millions of separate calculations would go wrong? Answer: They are overwhelming.

Mr. President, if any one scientist could give an answer to this question it would be David Parnas. Dr. Parnas was so highly considered by the Defense Department as an expert on star wars computer technology that SDI paid him \$1,000 a day as a consultant on star wars. Dr. Parnas has had a long and successful record in working with the Defense Department. Since Dr. Parnas is one of the outstanding

world experts on the capacity of computers, he was a natural in assisting the administration to develop the computer system necessary for coordinating and directing the Stars War Program.

What did this renowned expert, who was paid \$1,000 a day by the strategic defense agency, conclude about SDI's future? After a few months, Dr. Parnas recognized the impossibility of developing any kind of computer operation that could conceivably succeed in bringing together the infinitely complex nuclear and space technology of the strategic defense initiative. So what did Dr. Parnas do? Here was an expert paid the remarkable sum of \$1,000 per day for giving advice in a specialty where he was world-renowned. Dr. Parnas decided that this kind of computer system was an impossibility, that it could not work. So he spoke out in a language of surpassing eloquence. He quit. He turned down his \$1,000 a day job.

Why did Dr. Parnas say nix to a job for which he was so brilliantly qualified? Why did he walk out on a job that paid him so extraordinarily well? Why did this top computer expert say he would not take the taxpayer's money? Answer: Dr. Parnas said the strategic defense initiative would never work.

Mr. President, one of the achievements that makes Americans proud of our country is the remarkable number of our scientists who have won Nobel Prizes as the most eminent experts in the world. I have a list of some of these Nobel Prize winners who have announced their opposition to star wars. A number of these world-celebrated scientists who strongly oppose SDI or star wars have special expertise with respect to both space and nuclear weapons. Keep in mind that each of these experts has won the Nobel Prize for excellence in their field. For example, Hans Bethe, who made the principal contribution to the development of the hydrogen bomb; Philip Anderson of the physics department at Princeton; James W. Cronin of the Enrico Fermi Institute at the University of Chicago; Donald Glazer, professor of physics at the University of California at Berkeley; Tsung-Dao Lee of the department of physics, Columbia University; E.M. Purcell, Lyman Laboratory of Physics at Harvard University; James Rainwater, professor of physics at Columbia University; Steve Weinberg, department of physics at the University of Texas; and Kenneth Wilson of the Laboratory of Nuclear Studies at Cornell University.

Mr. President, there is no Member of Congress who can begin to have the understanding of the technological problems involved in space-based defense against nuclear weapons of the kind these scientists have. Again and

again, these experts tell us that SDI cannot work. It will not protect the American people against nuclear attack. They contend that it will, in fact, increase the risk of nuclear war. They argue that it will stimulate a dangerous competition in offensive nuclear arms. They call for superpower negotiations to achieve arms control agreements as the far better alternative.

Finally, Mr. President, here we have the most complex technology that mankind has ever attempted to achieve. We have just been heartbreakingly reminded of the fallibility of far simpler nuclear and space technology. The *Challenger* disaster and the Chernobyl meltdown are still vivid in our minds. Some experts tell us that SDI will cost the taxpayers of this country a trillion dollars or more. We know we can never test it under anything approaching realistic conditions. Does anyone really believe that star wars can work and work perfectly the first time it is ever challenged? This is what it will have to do. Here is one Senator who will tell you the answer is: "No way."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of the Nobel Prize-winning American scientists who oppose the star wars operations be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Philip W. Anderson, Physics Department, Princeton University; Nobel Laureate.

C.B. Anfinsen, Department of Biology, Johns Hopkins University; Nobel Laureate.

Kenneth J. Arrow, Joan Kenney Professor of Economics, Stanford University; Nobel Laureate.

Julius Axelrod, National Institute of Mental Health; Nobel Laureate.

Robert F. Bacher, Professor of Physics Emeritus, California Institute of Technology; formerly, Head, Experimental Physics Division, Los Alamos Laboratory.

Kenneth T. Bainbridge, G.V. Leverett Professor of Physics, Emeritus, Harvard University.

David Baltimore, Director, Whitehead Institute for Biomedical Research; Nobel Laureate.

John Bardeen, Department of Physics, University of Illinois; Nobel Laureate.

Gordon A. Baym, Department of Physics, University of Illinois.

Baruj Benacerraf, Department of Pathology, Harvard Medical School; Nobel Laureate.

Paul Berg, Wilson Professor of Biochemistry, Stanford University School of Medicine; Nobel Laureate.

Hans A. Bethe, Newman Laboratory for Nuclear Studies, Cornell University; Nobel Laureate.

Konrad E. Bloch, Department of Chemistry, Harvard University; Nobel Laureate.

Norris Edwin Bradbury, formerly, Director, Los Alamos Science Laboratory; winner, Enrico Fermi Award.

E. Margaret Burbidge, Director, Center for Astrophysics and Space Sciences, University of California at San Diego.

Joseph W. Chamberlain, Department of Space Physics and Astronomy, Rice University.

Owen Chamberlain, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, University of California at Berkeley; Nobel Laureate.

Subrahmanyan Chandrasekhar, Laboratory for Astrophysics and Space Research; Nobel Laureate.

Mildred Cohn, Benjamin Rush Professor of Physiological Chemistry, University of Pennsylvania.

Peter S. Conti, Chairman and Professor, Astrophysics, Planetary & Atmospheric Sciences, University of Colorado.

A.M. Cormack, Department of Physics, Tufts University; Nobel Laureate.

Ernest D. Courant, Senior Physicist, Brookhaven National Laboratory.

Andre Courmand, Columbia University College of Physicians; Nobel Laureate.

Albert V. Crewe, Physical Sciences Division, Enrico Fermi Institute, University of Chicago.

James W. Cronin, Enrico Fermi Institute, University of Chicago; Nobel Laureate.

Margaret B. Davis, Professor of Ecology, University of Minnesota.

Frank D. Drake, Dean of Natural Sciences, University of California at Santa Cruz.

Sidney D. Drell, Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, Stanford University.

Lee Alvin DuBridge, President Emeritus, California Institute of Technology; formerly, Presidential Science Advisor.

George A. Dulk, Professor, Astrophysical, Planetary, & Atmospheric Sciences, University of Colorado.

Walter M. Elsasser, Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences, Johns Hopkins University.

John F. Enders, University Professor of Bacteriology and Immunology Emeritus, Harvard Medical School; Nobel Laureate.

Katherine Esau, Professor of Botany Emeritus, University of California at Santa Barbara.

Bernard T. Feld, Professor of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Herman Feshbach, Department of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Val L. Fitch, Joseph Henry Laboratories, Princeton University; Nobel Laureate.

Marshall Fixman, Departments of Chemistry and Physics, Colorado State University.

Paul Flory, Professor of Chemistry, Stanford University; Nobel Laureate.

William A. Fowler, Institute Professor of Physics Emeritus, W.K. Kellogg Radiation Laboratory, California Institute of Technology; Nobel Laureate.

Hans Frauenfelder, Department of Physics, University of Illinois.

Jerome I. Friedman, Chairman and Professor, Department of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Charlotte Friend, Center for Experimental Cell Biology, City University of New York.

D. Carleton Gajdusek, National Institutes of Health; Nobel Laureate.

Richard L. Garwin, IBM Fellow and Science Advisor to Director of Research, T.J. Watson Research Center, IBM Corporation.

Donald A. Glaser, Professor of Physics and Molecular Biology, University of California at Berkeley; Nobel Laureate.

Sheldon Lee Glashow, Professor of Physics, Lyman Laboratory, Harvard University; Nobel Laureate.

Thomas Gold, Professor, Center for Radiophysics and Space Research, Cornell University.

Leo Goldberg, Kitt Peak National Observatory.

Gertrude S. Goldhaber, Department of Physics, Brookhaven National Laboratory.

Maurice Goldhaber, AUI Distinguished Scientist, Department of Physics, Brookhaven National Laboratory.

Leo A. Goodman, C.L. Hutchinson Distinguished Service Professor, Department of Statistics, University of Chicago.

George W. Greenlees, Professor of Physics, University of Minnesota.

George S. Hammond, Director, Laboratory for Energy and Chemical Process Research, Allied Chemical Corporation.

Bernhard Haurwitz, Department of Atmospheric Science, Colorado State University.

David S. Heesch, National Radio Astronomy Observatory.

Victor E. Henrich, Professor of Applied Physics, Yale University.

Gerhard P. Hochschild, Professor, Department of Mathematics, University of California at Berkeley.

Wassily Hoeffding, Department of Statistics, University of North Carolina.

Ronald Hoffman, Department of Chemistry, Cornell University; Nobel Laureate.

Robert Hofstadter, Department of Physics, Varian Lab of Physics, Stanford University; Nobel Laureate.

Robert W. Holley, Salk Institute for Biological Studies; Nobel Laureate.

Dorothy M. Horstmann, Senior Research Scientist, Yale University School of Medicine.

M. King Hubbert, Professor of Geology and Geophysics Emeritus, Stanford University.

David H. Hubel, Department of Neurobiology, Harvard Medical School; Nobel Laureate.

Charles Huggins, Ben May Laboratory for Cancer Research, University of Chicago; Nobel Laureate.

John R. Huizenga, Tracy H. Harris, Professor of Chemistry and Physics, University of Rochester.

Donald M. Hunten, Professor of Planetary Sciences, Lunar and Planetary Laboratory, University of Arizona.

Robert T. Jones, Senior Research Associate, NASA Ames Research Center.

Leo P. Kadanoff, Professor of Physics, James Franck Institute and Enrico Fermi Institute, University of Chicago.

H. Gobind Khorana, Department of Biology and Chemistry, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Nobel Laureate.

Walter Kohn, Former Director and Professor, Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of California at Santa Barbara.

Arthur Komberg, Department of Biochemistry, Stanford University Medical School; Nobel Laureate.

William L. Kraushaar, Department of Physics, University of Wisconsin.

Polykarp Kusch, Eugene McDermott Professor of Physics, University of Texas, Dallas; Nobel Laureate.

Tsung-Dao Lee, Department of Physics, Columbia University; Nobel Laureate.

Wassily Leontief, Institute for Economic Analysis, New York University; Nobel Laureate.

Luna B. Leopold, Department of Geology and Geophysics, University of California at Berkeley.

Fritz Lipmann, Professor of Biochemistry, Rockefeller University; Nobel Laureate.

William N. Lipscomb, Department of Chemistry, Harvard University; Nobel Laureate.

Francis E. Low, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Salvador E. Luria, Institute Professor of Biology, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Nobel Laureate.

Willem J. Luyten, Space Science Center, University of Minnesota.

J. Ross Macdonald, William Rand Kenan, Jr. Professor of Physics, Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of North Carolina.

Robert E. Marshak, University Distinguished Professor, Physics Department, Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

Barbara McClintock, Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory; Nobel Laureate.

Edwin M. McMillan, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, University of California at Berkeley; Nobel Laureate.

Dimitri M. Mihalas, Senior Scientist, High Altitude Observatory, National Center for Atmospheric Research.

Phillip Morrison, Institute Professor of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Norman F. Ness, Laboratory for Extraterrestrial Physics, NASA.

Elizabeth F. Neyfeld, Department of Biological Chemistry, University of California at Los Angeles School of Medicine.

Edward P. Ney, School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Minnesota.

Alfred O. C. Nier, School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Minnesota.

Severo Ochoa, Distinguished Member, Roche Institute of Molecular Biology; Nobel Laureate.

George E. Palade, Section of Cell Biology, Yale University School of Medicine; Nobel Laureate.

Mary-Lou Pardue, Biology Department, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Linis Pauling, formerly Chair, Division of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, California Institute of Technology; Nobel Laureate for both Chemistry and Peace David Pines, Department of Physics, University of Illinois.

George W. Preston III, Mount Wilson and Las Campanas Observatories, Carnegie Institution of Washington.

E. M. Purcell, Lyman Laboratory of Physics, Harvard University; Nobel Laureate.

L. James Rainwater, Professor of Physics, Columbia University; Nobel Laureate.

Norman F. Ramsey, Higgins Professor of Physics, Harvard University; formerly, Head, Delivery Group, Los Alamos Laboratory, and first Science Advisor to NATO.

Helen M. Ranney, Chair, Department of Medicine, University of California at San Diego.

Sarah Ratner, Member Emeritus, Department of Biochemistry, Public Health Institute of the City of New York.

Richard J. Reed, Professor, Department of Atmospheric Sciences, University of Washington.

Roger Revelle, Professor of Science and Public Policy, Program in Science, Technology & Public Affairs, University of California at San Diego.

Julia Robinson, Professor of Mathematics, University of California at Berkeley.

Vera C. Rubin, Professor of Terrestrial Magnetism, Carnegie Institute.

Elizabeth S. Russell, Senior Staff Scientist, Jackson Laboratory.

Albert S. Sabin, Emeritus Distinguished Service Professor, University of Cincinnati College of Medicine; developer of oral polio vaccine.

Robert G. Sachs, Professor of Physics, Enrico Fermi Institute and Department of Physics, University of Chicago.

Carl Sagan, Duncan Professor of Astronomy, Cornell University; author, "Cosmos".

Ruth Sager, Chief, Division of Cancer Genetics, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute.

Arthur L. Schawlow, J.G. Jackson & C.J. Wood Professor, Department of Physics, Stanford University, Nobel Laureate.

Glenn T. Seaborg, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, University of California at Berkeley; Nobel Laureate.

Emilio Segre, Department of Physics, University of California at Berkeley.

Herbert A. Simon, Professor of Computer Science and Psychology, Carnegie-Mellon University; Nobel Laureate.

Maxine F. Singer, Chief, Laboratory of Biochemistry, National Cancer Institute, National Institutes of Health.

B.F. Skinner, Professor of Psychology Emeritus, Harvard University; author, "Walden Two".

Cyril Stanley Smith, Institute Professor of Metallurgy Emeritus, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; formerly, Associate Division Leader for Metallurgy, Los Alamos Laboratory, Presidential Science Advisor.

Albert Szent-Gyorgyi, Director of Research, Woods Hole Marine Biological Laboratory; Nobel Laureate.

Henry Taube, Department of Chemistry, Stanford University; Nobel Laureate.

Lewis Thomas, President Emeritus, Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center; author, "Lives of the Cell," "Medusa and the Snail".

James Tobin, Department of Economics, Yale University; Nobel Laureate.

J.A. Van Allen, Professor of Physics, University of Iowa.

George Wald, Biological Laboratories, Harvard University; Nobel Laureate.

J.D. Watson, Director, Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory; Nobel Laureate.

Steven Weinberg, Department of Physics, University of Texas; Nobel Laureate.

Jerome B. Wiesner, formerly, President, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Chairman, Technology Assessment Advisory Council of the U.S. Congress; Staff Director, U.S. Delegation to the Geneva Conference for the Prevention of Surprise Attack; Presidential Science Advisor.

Kenneth G. Wilson, Laboratory of Nuclear Studies, Cornell University; Nobel Laureate.

Robert R. Wilson, Newman Laboratory, Department of Physics, Cornell University.

Robert W. Wilson, Head, Radio Physics Research Department, Bell Laboratories; Nobel Laureate.

Evelyn M. Witkin, Barbara McClintock Professor of Genetics, Waksman Institute of Microbiology, Rutgers University.

This list includes few of the better-known signatories to the Appeal. The full list includes fifty-four Nobel Laureates, a majority of the National Academy of Sciences, and many other members of the scientific community.

MYTH OF THE DAY: THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN BORN TO TEENAGERS IS RISING

Mr. PROXIMIRE. Mr. President, the myth of the day is that the number of children born to teenagers is growing by leaps and bounds.

While there is no question that teenage pregnancy is a serious problem

and raises serious challenges for Federal, State, and local public policy—not to mention the serious risks it presents for the young mother—it is important to realize that births to teenagers represent a declining proportion of all births in this country.

That's right, a declining proportion. And that drop holds true even when you take into account the fact that there are fewer teenagers today than just a few years ago.

Here is a chart that shows that the percentage of babies born to teenagers dropped from 19 percent to 14 percent over the 7 years from 1975 to 1982. Meanwhile, the percentage born to mothers over 30 had increased from 17 percent up to 22 percent.

As you can see, Mr. President, all births to teenagers dropped consistently and dramatically since 1975. In that year, teenage mothers accounted for 19 percent in 1975. Today, teenagers account for fewer than 14 percent of all births.

By contrast, the percentage of births for women over 30 has risen just as consistently and significantly. In 1975, women over 30 accounted for fewer than 17 percent of all births. By 1978 the two curves—teenage mothers and mothers over 30—crossed and mothers over 30 now account for over 22 percent of all births in this country.

Mr. President, there is no question that teenage pregnancy remains an important issue for Federal, State, and local policymakers and I am not attempting to minimize it in the least. But we must keep the problem in its proper perspective and there has indeed been progress in reducing births to teenagers.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 1 p.m., with statements therein limited to 5 minutes each.

HEALTH RESEARCH FUNDS

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, This past month, both the Senate and House of Representatives passed their own versions of the fiscal year 1987 budget resolution. Passage by both Chambers is only the first step in enacting a 1987 budget. As a member of both the Senate Appropriations and Budget Committees, I am involved in every step of this process.

It is through the Appropriations Committee, and in particular, my membership on the Labor, Health, Human Services, and Education Subcommittee, that I often learn of the numerous accomplishments continually occurring in biomedical research. I

have had the privilege of sitting on this subcommittee with its most distinguished chairman, the senior Senator from Connecticut, LOWELL P. WEICKER.

Senator WEICKER's tireless efforts as chairman of the subcommittee have enabled millions to pursue higher education and countless others to reap the benefits that emerge daily from countless laboratories and hospitals across our Nation.

Through the leadership of Senator WEICKER, the Senate passed a budget resolution that will allow the National Institutes of Health, our major arm for biomedical research, to continue making further breakthroughs in such dreaded diseases as AIDS, cancer, heart disease, alzheimers, cystic fibrosis, and countless others.

Two weeks ago, Senator WEICKER spoke before a special academic convocation of the Albert Einstein College of Medicine. His remarks eloquently illustrate both the necessity and urgency for increasing health research funds. I strongly urge my colleagues to read both our distinguished colleague's address and to remember his remarks the next time our Nation's health care budget is debated on the Senate floor.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR LOWELL WEICKER, JR.,
BEFORE A SPECIAL ACADEMIC CONVOCATION
OF ALBERT EINSTEIN COLLEGE OF MEDICINE

First, let me congratulate Dr. Peter Davies and his colleagues for their recent research breakthrough relative to diagnosing Alzheimer's disease. As a layman, I've often wondered what it must be like that moment in the laboratory when a piece of the puzzle fits for a change. I wonder if you can hear in your mind's ear the expressions of hope that your work brings to the lips of millions of people—starting in this instance with the nearly two million Americans who suffer with Alzheimer's.

Believe me, they are out there and they and their families, their friends, indeed, the people of the world—cheer the reports of your work.

I wish I had those kinds of days at the office. By reputation, our two kinds of work are very different. For your profession, there is, for example, the words of Hippocrates, who said, "Wherever the art of medicine is loved, there also is love of humanity."

For my profession, there are unfortunately, too often words like those of Will Rogers, who said, "The country has come to feel the same when Congress is in session as when the baby gets hold of a hammer."

But in fact, in the United States, the worlds of politics and health have never existed apart. A nation that expected of its political leaders preeminence in defending the rights of man expected no less when it came to overcoming human illness with the fruits of science. The scourge of deadly disease in this nation did not so much afflict our people as stir a giant of purpose within them. It was this marriage of interests that built the greatest engine of scientific accomplishment the world has ever known, the United States, acting largely through the National Institutes of Health. And with this

partnership of government and science, the nation faced polio, measles, rubella, diphtheria, scarlet fever and more. Each in turn was silenced.

The historian Will Durant has said, "The health of nations is more important than the wealth of nations." He was saying no more than is said a hundred times a day in personal conversations. "If you've got your health, you've got everything." But what is said personally is not being contemporaneously stated as national policy.

The statistics of medicine and budgets belie the importance each of us puts on health.

Each year, 855,000 Americans are diagnosed as having cancer and about half will die from the disease.

100,000 Americans will die this year as a result of allergic and infectious diseases.

Thousands of infants die each year in this country as a result of Respiratory Distress Syndrome.

300 million people worldwide are afflicted with Malaria and each year one million will die of the disease.

15 million Americans suffer from chronic lung disease.

60 million Americans suffer from heart disease.

3.5 million Americans are disabled by stroke or other injuries to the nervous system.

In the budget, the nation's domestic needs, led by health care, have lost badly in the past five years. A chart of federal spending includes the categories of defense, interest on the national debt, entitlement programs and non-defense discretionary programs. A 1980 version of that chart would show that this latter category received 25 percent of the budget. The 1985 share for that category was 17 percent.

Since one percent of the budget is approximately nine billion dollars, this eight percent decline means the federal share for these programs has dropped some 72 billion dollars below the distribution levels of 1980. More federal dollars are spent on the defense research and development budget in 15 months than the total spent on biomedical research since the establishment of the NIH in 1937.

Again this year as in every year, the Appropriations Subcommittee on Health and Human Services heard from dozens of health professionals and private citizens urging a renewed federal commitment to health research and medical services.

The dry statistics of disease and dollars came to us in the moving voices of those for whom a partnership with federal health research is not luxury, but life.

We learn of research into brittle bone disease from twelve-year-old Congie, whose bones can shatter without warning, without movement, at any time.

Dystrophic epidermolysis bullosa comes to us in the person of six-year-old Ray, who was born with no skin on his face and suffers with the pain of skin grafts and the constant fear of contracting an infection.

A doctor and father whose child suffers from Batten's disease tells us of this deadly neurological disorder which is probably the most common type of neurogenetic storage disease in children. It usually manifests itself in previously normal children between the ages of four and eight and may leave children totally disabled, perhaps dead in their late teens or twenties.

Those of us who sit there day after day sometimes feel the stories should be enough to spark a tireless search for cures. There is

the individual agony of 1.8 million Alzheimer's victims, gradually robbed of their memory, their ability to function, and finally, their lives. There are the newborn who will never testify to anything other than being part of an inexcusable statistic that ranks this most prosperous of nations seventeenth in infant mortality worldwide.

Year after year in the appropriations process of the federal government, we fill the well of compassion with stories of hurting and dying. And we assume by the depth of this well that it can satisfy what surely must be a hardened political establishment that continually fails to properly fund health research efforts.

We sit in our living rooms night after night tuned into the separate profiles in courage of the diseased and their families. In the last month alone, the programs have included one about Father Damien, who worked with the lepers of Molokai, one about Alex Deford, who lost her battle with cystic fibrosis and a drama concerning a young man's battle with AIDS.

Each night before these programs aired as entertainment, the nightly news, brought us disaster of a different sort. A nuclear accident in the Soviet Union, actions and reactions to terrorism, the loss of a space shuttle.

And toward the end of each item of news, there follows a vow from political leaders and others involved that the tragedy will be treated with a renewed resolve, a redoubling of effort. The legacy of disaster in this nation is almost always a commitment to overcoming rather than walking away from the problem.

But disease is somehow successfully portrayed as nothing more than individual dramas of persistence. Mark Twain said we can easily learn to endure adversity as long as it is another man's. And if that other man, or woman, or child is faced with Cystic Fibrosis, Arthritis, Alzheimer's disease, Leukemia, AIDS or Juvenile Diabetes, the average American feels he can offer little more than sympathy.

I am here to suggest that the time for quiet sympathy in this partnership of medicine and government is over. The progress in scientific accomplishment that we have marveled at for 30 years in this nation must now be matched by progress in public policy. For so long, we have fueled the engine of scientific progress on compassion alone. And so when it came time to pay for the deficit, compassion was sacrificed to pay the bill. When it came time to pay for national defense, again we drew from this well of compassion to pick up the check.

Now the well is nearly dry. The fact that we hold a consensus to fund emergency research into AIDS, can't mask the fact that we are in danger of losing the political consensus upon which progress in health research depends. And this danger comes from the failure of the health and science community to understand the rough and tumble yet very telling world of dollars and cents, where the support of the American people is won by those who have the guts to make their case.

Approximately 38 billion dollars a year is spent on the direct care of Alzheimer's patients and the indirect costs to the family in lost workdays. Yet only 50 million dollars is spent on research into the disease. We know the incidence of Alzheimer's increases with age and so we know with certainty that the cost to society can only increase without adequate research. Thirty percent of people in their 80's have the disease. Between now

and the years 2000, the size of the population group aged 55 and older is expected to increase by 19 percent; those 65 and over will increase 27 percent; and the number 75 and older will increase by over 50 percent. It is projected that by the next century nine million people will be victims of Alzheimer's disease. In the face of this certainty, what is our response as a nation? A continued push to reduce support of the National Institute of Aging, the lack of any sort of support for training of health professionals in the field of geriatrics, and the elimination of clinical trials.

Forty thousand low-weight babies are born in the U.S. each year. Fifty percent of these cases could be prevented by additional research and proper prenatal care. This would cost us 26 million dollars a year. Without it, each year, we are spending 2.4 billion dollars. In fact, the key federal efforts designed to stop these deaths has actually declined by five percent since 1983.

Since 1982 vaccine prices have risen by a whopping 500 percent, but appropriations for the nation's childhood immunization program have not kept pace. As a result, the number of children to whom we can provide vaccines has dropped by two thirds. Currently less than half of all black preschool children are immunized against the scourges of our history books like diphtheria, pertussis, tetanus and polio.

Under the president's budget, the National Institutes of Health budget stood 400 million dollars below the fiscal year 1986 level.

A cut of this magnitude meant 48 of 57 approved clinical trials would not be funded. These trials are the final test of the promising research investments made years ago. Now, there is a very real possibility the NIH will not be able to prove out new vaccines and new treatments for multiple sclerosis and Parkinson's disease, or glaucoma, for controlling epileptic seizures, for enhancing bone marrow transplants.

Bad enough we refuse to fund old knowledge that works as in the case of childhood immunization. But to close the door on imminent scientific discovery as in the case of clinical trials is know-nothing budgeteering at its worst.

There's no point in shaking a fist at someone else. The decline in public support is not the fault of the president or the far right or the Pentagon or any combination of other people. It's us. The budget is the most unerring, unemotional reflection of us as can be found in the entire democratic process.

Remember in the 1960s, during the struggle for civil rights in this nation how many of us in the Northeast said that civil rights legislation in Congress was being blocked by a few filibustering southern senators. Well, history has taught us it had very little to do with a few southern senators. The prejudice of the South was the prejudice of the East, West and North. And when the conscience of the nation was pricked by Dr. King, civil rights legislation rolled through the United States Senate and no combination of forces could stop it. When the nation wanted civil rights it got civil rights.

So it will be when the life of each American is as important as the death of a speculative enemy; when the enhancement of life joins survival in the definition of national security. Then, education and science will roll through the Congress.

Make no mistake. What we want, we will have to pay for. We can't fill that well of compassion with the leavings of high military spending and low taxes. What I'm talk-

ing about is a fight; a battle that appeals both to the common humanity of Americans and their common sense.

No group is as well equipped to lead this fight as the men and women of medical science. You have the vision and optimism that brought you to this place of learning in the first instance. You have a piece of paper that attests to your skills.

Now, when it comes to the priorities of this nation, what is needed is your anger not your academics, your activism not your antipathy. Better than any, you in this room know the coinage of suffering that will be required as substitute for the lack of dollars spent on medical research.

You owe as much of a no to that as to all the forms of death and disease you'll confront in a lifetime.

A moment ago, I spoke of the television drama concerning the life of Alex Deford. Frank Deford, the writer, spoke to my subcommittee about the dramatic breakthroughs in molecular genetics in developing treatment for Cystic Fibrosis. A systematic approach is now possible for the gene that causes CF, the most common fatal genetic disease in the United States.

The breakthrough came too late for Alexandra Deford, who died of the disease in her father's arms on a Saturday afternoon in January of 1980 at the age of eight. Frank Deford's message to us is a message we should repeat and repeat again to the American people.

"Our time is now," he said. "As much as I wanted to say those words when my child was alive, I honestly couldn't. Now I can. Our time is now."

Thank you.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

□ 1400

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEVENS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If there is not further morning business, morning business is closed.

FEDERAL FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL ACT AUTHORIZATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume consideration of S. 2180, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2180) to authorize appropriations for activities under the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, at the time at which this bill was last under consideration on Thursday, there was

a considerable colloquy involving myself and the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, among others, on the possibility of a second-degree amendment on the subject of scrambling of television signals as an amendment to one which I am about to propose extending the opening date of daylight saving time to the first Monday in April. There has been considerable discussion on that subject since that point. I am now prepared to offer the daylight saving time amendment and I wonder whether the Senator from Kentucky has any requests he would like to make before that amendment is offered.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Washington is absolutely right. Last Thursday, when we adjourned, we were in a lengthy discussion as it related to an amendment in the second degree as it related to the scrambling of television signals. At that time, we were asking for a hearing, otherwise we were insistent on submitting our amendment in the second degree. There has been a great deal of work done by the distinguished Senator from Washington and others over the weekend.

It is now my understanding that the chairman of the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee, Senator DANFORTH, and Senator GORTON now are willing to offer a time certain as it relates to a hearing on this particular question and I am amenable to that. If the distinguished Senator from Washington will put into the RECORD the time or the week, I believe it is the week of July 14, in which a hearing on scrambling will be held, I would be perfectly willing then to withhold my amendment as it relates to the scrambling in the second degree to his daylight saving time amendment.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky is correct about those discussions and negotiations. I should add, however, that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Communications is the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. Senator GOLDWATER has graciously acceded to our request that the subcommittee hold a hearing on the subject of the scrambling of television signals on the 15th, 16th, or 17th of July and that this Senator from Washington, who is a member of that subcommittee, will in fact chair that meeting. Assuming that that undertaking, that such a hearing would be held on one of those three dates, is approved by the Senator from Kentucky, we will simply go forward and debate the subject of daylight saving time.

□ 1410

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, that it is perfectly agreeable with me that the

hearings be held either the 15th, 16th, or 17th of July.

Upon the assurance of the Senator from Washington, I have no further interest in introducing the amendment as it relates to scrambling.

AMENDMENT NO. 1967

(Purpose: To add provisions regarding daylight saving time)

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I have sent an amendment to the desk, and I ask it be considered immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON] proposes an amendment numbered 1967.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:
Sec. 2. (a) The Congress finds—

(1) that various studies of governmental and nongovernmental agencies indicate that daylight saving time over an expanded period would produce a significant energy savings in electrical power consumption;

(2) that daylight saving time may yield energy savings in other areas besides electrical power consumption;

(3) that daylight saving time over an expanded period could serve as an incentive for further energy conservation by individuals, companies, and the various governmental entities at all levels of government, and that such energy conservation efforts could lead to greatly expanded energy savings; and

(4) that the use of daylight saving time over an expanded period could have other beneficial effects on the public interest, including the reduction of crime, improved traffic safety, more daylight outdoor playtime for the children and youth of our Nation, greater utilization of parks and recreation areas, expanded economic opportunity through extension of daylight hours to peak shopping hours and through extension of domestic office hours to periods of greater overlap with the European Economic Community.

(b) Section 3(a) of the Uniform Time Act of 1966 (15 U.S.C. 260a(a)) is amended by striking "last Sunday of April" and inserting in lieu thereof "first Sunday of April".

(c) Any law in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) adopted pursuant to section 3(a)(2) of the Uniform Time Act of 1966 by a State with parts thereof in more than one time zone, or

(2) adopted pursuant to section 3(a)(1) of such Act by a State that lies entirely within one time zone,

shall be held and considered to remain in effect as the exercise by that State of the exemption permitted by such Act unless that State, by law, provides that such exemption shall not apply.

(d)(1) Notwithstanding any other law or any regulation issued under any such law, the Federal Communications Commission shall, consistent with any existing treaty or other agreement, make such adjustment by

general rules, or by interim action pending such general rules, with respect to hours of operation of daytime standard amplitude modulation broadcast stations, as may be consistent with the public interest, including the public's interest in receiving interference-free service.

(2) Such general rules, or interim action, may include variances with respect to operating power and other technical operating characteristics.

(3) Subsequent to the adoption of such general rules, they may be varied with respect to particular stations and areas because of the exigencies in each case.

(e) This section shall take effect 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, except that if such effective date occurs in any calendar year after March 1, this section shall take effect on the first day of the following calendar year.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to extend the annual observance of daylight savings time.

Under current law, daylight saving time begins each year on the last Sunday of April and ends on the last Sunday of October. My amendment would change the starting date to the first Sunday of April. This represents a 3-week extension, or 4 weeks in years when April has five Sundays.

The purpose of daylight saving time is to make the hours of daylight coincide with the hours of the day in which people are awake and active. Under daylight saving time, sunrise and sunset each occur an hour later than under standard time. I am proposing to begin daylight saving time in early April because, under current law, April has the earliest sunrises of the year, and I believe that most Americans would rather have an hour of daylight in the early evening than in the early morning.

Mr. President, sunrises in April under standard time in Washington, DC, ranged from 5:17 to 5:53 a.m.; most of us slept through the early hours of daylight. Sunsets under standard time in April ranged from 6:31 to 6:55 p.m.; many of us commuted home in darkness. If this amendment is adopted, daylight saving time would have begun on April 6 and the hours of daylight in April would have corresponded much more closely with our lifestyles than under standard time. Sunrises and sunsets in April under daylight saving time would be equivalent to those in early August through mid-September, and even the opponents of my amendment support daylight saving time during the period of the year.

We do not have to imagine the effects of extended daylight saving time, because the Congress did extend daylight saving time temporarily during the energy crisis of the 1970's. The Department of Transportation estimates that energy savings equivalent to 100,000 barrels of oil per day resulted from extended daylight saving time, and studies have shown that the trans-

fer of an hour of daylight to the end of the day enhanced traffic safety and reduced violent crime. The Department supports a 2-month extension of daylight saving time.

Many industries also stand to benefit from extended daylight saving time, including nurserymen, convenience stores, the barbecue industry, the travel and tourism industry, and sporting goods manufacturers. Extended daylight saving time would increase revenues and employment in these industries, and would generate significant tax revenues at no cost to the Federal Government.

The House of Representatives has passed a bill, H.R. 2095, which would begin daylight saving time on the first Sunday of April, as my amendment proposes, and would also extend daylight saving time 1 week into November. I have not included the November extension in my amendment because I am sensitive to the concerns of the opponents of this amendment that daylight saving time in November would create sunrises sufficiently late to be detrimental to many Americans. I do not believe that these concerns apply to April, which, as I mentioned, has the earliest sunrises of the year under the present system.

Mr. President, I believe that this amendment balances the interests and concerns on both sides of this issue and I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I should also like to say, Mr. President, that the distinguished Senator from Maine, Mr. MITCHELL, is a co-sponsor and has been a prime sponsor of the bills on this subject during all of the Congresses during which I have served, and is very strongly supportive of the amendment—support which I appreciate.

DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME

Mr. DANFORTH. Mr. President, I support the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington [Senator GORTON], and my colleagues from Maine [Mr. MITCHELL and Mr. COHEN], California [Mr. WILSON and Mr. CRANSTON], Rhode Island [Mr. PELL and Mr. CHAFEE], Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA], and Minnesota [Mr. BOSCHWITZ].

The Congress has a difficult task in trying to determine the optimal period for daylight saving time because many regions and individuals are affected differently by daylight saving time. Indeed, many people have urged us to adopt year-round daylight saving time while many others would prefer no daylight saving time at all.

The principal concern which underlies opposition to this amendment is that daylight saving causes sunrises to be an hour later than under standard time. Many Senators are concerned that these later sunrises will endanger rural schoolchildren on the roads in early morning darkness and will cause

farmers, who work by the Sun, to lose an hour of early morning daylight in which to perform chores.

I share these concerns for schoolchildren and farmers. I have not supported previous proposals to extend daylight saving time because late sunrises would be detrimental to the interests of Missouri. However, this amendment would not result in sunrises later than at many other times of the year. As Senator GORTON has pointed out, the amendment applies to a period in April which has the earliest sunrises of the year. I endorse this amendment as a compromise, which does not create sunrises as late as those in many months of both daylight and standard time, and which does provide the advantages of an extra hour of daylight in the April evenings.

Mr. President, I would like to discuss the origins of the objections to this amendment. Many of the objections stem from our experience with extended daylight saving time in the 1970's, when, in order to conserve energy, the Congress called for year-round observance of daylight saving time. This law created problems in the winter months, when the sunrises are already late under standard time. Many of us associate today's proposal with observance of daylight saving time in the winter. In reality, there is no comparison. In my hometown of St. Louis, sunrise under daylight saving time on January 15 would occur, and did in 1974, at 8:17 a.m. Clearly, this created problems for schoolchildren, farmers, and many Missourians. Sunrise on April 15 under this amendment, however, would occur at 6:25 a.m.

I hope that my colleagues will remember, when they hear arguments about the detriments of daylight saving time, that many of the criticisms are aimed at January, while the amendment is aimed at April.

Another common reason for opposing extended daylight saving time is the thought that we should not tamper with time. We hear objections to changing natural time, or "God's time", as it is often called. I am certain that my colleagues understand that the calculation of time itself is not natural but man-made, and that the Uniform Time Act of 1966, which created our current 6-month daylight saving time period, was certainly not an act of God. The natural elements are the sunrise and sunset, which I can assure my colleagues will not be changed by this amendment.

Mr. President, the potential benefits of and public support for this proposal are clear. Extended daylight saving time would save energy, enhance traffic safety, reduce violent crime, and create substantial business for many industries. The general public supports extended daylight saving time by

a margin greater than 2 to 1, and the administration supports a 2-month extension of daylight saving time. I will not dwell upon these points because I do not believe that they are disputed by opponents of the amendment.

Instead, I would like to discuss the concerns of farmers. The American Farm Bureau Federation believes that daylight saving time should be observed only from Memorial Day to Labor Day—a period of just more than 3 months. I would like to point out that most sunrises in April under daylight saving time would be as early as sunrises during this 3-month period. Sunrise on April 26, which was this year's earliest sunrise, would be the same as sunrise on August 10 under daylight saving time. Therefore, this amendment will not adversely affect farmers.

I urge my colleagues who are skeptical about extending daylight saving time, as I was, to examine the effects of daylight saving time in April, as I have. I believe that you will find no reason to oppose this amendment, and every reason to support it.

Mr. MITCHELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator GORTON in cosponsoring this amendment to extend daylight saving time in a manner that will offer numerous benefits to the Nation.

It represents a safe, straightforward, positive way of increased energy savings, decreased traffic fatalities, reduced violent crime, enhance the lives of persons who suffer from night blindness, and add to the hours that Americans can spend outdoors. Few proposals submitted to the Senate offer such clearcut gains and enjoy such broad support as this measure.

I want to emphasize what Senator GORTON has said—that this amendment represents a compromise. Other daylight saving time extension bills have sought to expand the Nation's observance of daylight saving time by as much as 8 weeks. On October 22 of last year, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 2095 to extend it by 4 weeks. I am an original cosponsor of S. 1433 which was identical to the House bill. However, in the interest of compromise this amendment proposes an extension of 3 weeks.

The original bill would have extended daylight saving time by 4 weeks beginning its observance the first Sunday in April rather than the last Sunday in April as it is under current law, and ending it on the first Sunday in November rather than the last Sunday in October, as is the case under current law.

This compromise amendment drops off the week-long extension from the last Sunday in October to the first

Sunday in November. That fall extension was intended to promote child safety through an additional hour of daylight in the early evening on Halloween. However, October also is a month when sunrise comes later each morning, and we are willing to accommodate that concern by this compromise.

We have ensured that sunrise times under the extended system of daylight saving time will occur no later than sunrise times presently occurring in the fall under the current system.

Sunrises in April will occur no later than sunrises which we already experience in the fall each year under the existing system.

Daylight saving time was first used in World Wars I and II as a way to conserve energy. The Uniform Time Act of 1966 formally implemented national daylight saving time in its present 6-month period. As a response to the 1973 oil crisis, Congress enacted the Emergency Daylight Saving Time Energy Conservation Act extending it to 10 months in 1974, and 8 months in 1975.

Daylight saving time is intimately tied to the United States desire for energy conservation and energy independence. Indeed, it is an idea with roots in the era of America's Declaration of Independence.

One of the first proponents of daylight saving time was Benjamin Franklin, who awoke one morning in Paris in 1784 to a room filled with sunlight. He realized that many Parisians spent sunlit hours sleeping, and later burned candles while awake at night. Franklin later wrote:

It is impossible that a wise people would have made use of unhealthy and expensive candlelight if they had known as I have just learned that they can have for nothing the beautiful and pure light of the sun.

Franklin proposed to encourage, although fortunately not seriously, the use of sunlight rather than candles through a tax on window shutters, the rationing of candles, and the firing of cannons in the streets at sunrise to awake citizens and make them open their eyes to their true interests. Nonetheless, the essence of Franklin's idea remains true today. Over 200 years later, it is no longer simply candlelight which is wasted.

In 1975 the Department of Transportation study on the impact of the 1974 daylight saving time extension estimated that the equivalent of 100,000 barrels of oil was saved each day. Under the compromise amendment, more than 2 million barrels of oil could be saved each year.

The U.S. energy situation has changed since 1975. Fuel prices are the primary factor in controlling fuel use, and the price of oil has dramatically fallen in recent months. But we live in an uncertain world. Iran and Iraq are

at war along the Persian Gulf. American bombs have fallen on Tripoli and Benghazi in Libya. Tensions and terrorism still flare in the Middle East, and lines of commerce are always fragile.

The need for energy conservation—and vigilance—is undiminished. DST is one small means of conservation, with large benefits, and at absolutely no financial cost to the Federal Government or the American consumer.

As Benjamin Franklin advised, we must open our eyes to our true interests.

The argument for an extension of daylight saving time becomes even more compelling when one considers benefits of increased traffic safety and violent crime reductions.

The 1975 Department of Transportation study showed a 0.7-percent reduction in traffic fatalities in March and April 1974, under extended daylight saving time, compared to comparable months that same year under standard time. This estimate was, I understand, a conservative calculation, and Department analysts believed the actual reduction to be more on the order of between 1.5 and 2 percent.

Second, according to the National Crime Survey of the Departments of Justice and Commerce, the most serious forms of crime occur in the evening or at night, rather than the early morning hours. Criminals prefer to operate under cover of darkness. Increased daylight in the critical hours when many Americans are coming home from work can act as an important deterrent to crime.

I am aware of fears that expanded daylight saving time would increase early-morning traffic accidents, especially involving school children, and inconvenience our Nation's farmers. Maine is a rural State, where many earn their living by agriculture, and the majority of school children are bused to school. I am therefore extremely sensitive to these concerns. However, after close study of these arguments, I believe they are without foundation.

There is little proof that a month's extension of daylight saving time adversely affects American agriculture. The 1975 Department of Transportation study stated flatly:

DST does not affect agricultural activities or production. In general, agricultural activities are insensitive to "clock time," and farmers and ranchers (as well as most other groups in agriculture) are not vitally concerned with what type of time system is used. Farmer's activities are determined by seasonal factors and are principally geared to the hours of sunlight, and these patterns pertain irrespective of clock setting.

The safety of schoolchildren similarly is not adversely affected. The Department's 1975 study also concluded that for the January to April 1974 daylight saving time period:

School-age children were not subject to greater involvement in fatal accidents than the general population at any period of the day.

A 1976 National Bureau of Standards study of school-age children fatalities also found no increase in morning fatalities during the March and April daylight saving time period.

A Department of Transportation analysis of daylight saving time between 1979 and 1981 additionally concluded that "there appears to be no basis for claims that DST transitions caused increases in schoolchildren morning fatalities."

I wish to reiterate to my Senate colleagues that this amendment also is a compromise. Daylight saving time would begin the first Sunday in April—rather than the last Sunday in April under the current system, or in March, as other bills have proposed.

Sunrise times in the spring would occur no later than the times presently occurring in the fall under the existing system. Farmers and schoolchildren would not be subjected to early morning conditions any different from those that they already live under.

Older school-age children coming home in the evening, particularly if they have participated in school sports or other extracurricular activities, stand to benefit from the extra hour of daylight.

In 1976, the Senate approved an extension of DST by a vote of 70 to 23, but the measure died in the House in the final hours of that Congress.

In 1981, the House of Representatives approved a DST extension, but no action occurred in the Senate.

During this current Congress, the House of Representatives has again passed a DST extension. The measure enjoys broad popular support, and the decision now rests with the Senate.

Americans are looking to us to finally write into law a proposal which is eminently practical and reasonable. Like the hands of time itself, Congress may sometimes move slowly. But I submit to you—with no pun intended—that the time finally has come in this Congress, to enact an extension of daylight saving time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

Mr. FORD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, would the Chair advise who controls the time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no controlled time.

Mr. FORD. Who are the floor managers?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The floor manager of the majority is the Senator from Washington. The Chair is not advised as to the minority manager.

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, the proposal by the plaintiffs in this particular case, the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Maine, presented such a weak case for the extension of daylight saving time I doubt seriously that the defense should put on any witnesses but just leave the judgment to the jury. But in all fairness, I must represent my people and represent the hundreds and hundreds of people who have contacted my office in opposition to any extension of daylight saving time.

You always put your best foot forward in this type of situation. I was amused that the distinguished Senator from Maine, as he elaborated all the times the House had passed daylight saving time, failed to enumerate the number of times the House had defeated the extension of daylight saving time.

So, Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Washington and the distinguished Senator from Maine which would extend daylight saving time another 3 weeks.

In preparing for this debate, I ran across several quotes I would like to share with my colleagues.

Many people have questioned why I am so interested in not extending daylight saving time for another month or another 3 weeks, and why it is such an emotional issue in my State.

A State senator in the Kentucky General Assembly ranks daylight saving time as "one of the three most emotional issues of my service in the Kentucky General Assembly."

He also adds:

Time is more important to people than the budget. They don't care how much we spend, apparently; they just want to know what time we are going to spend it on.

I recently heard from a Kentucky mother who found it just as hard to get a child to go to bed while it was daylight as it is to get a child to wake up while it is still dark.

Any Kentucky mother who has sent a first grader out to catch a bus on a dark, misty April morning takes a dim view about the importance of electricity that might be saved on the east and west coasts and the number of after-work tennis games that might be played here in Washington, DC.

Before the Commerce Committee hearings, I heard from a constituent in Louisville. I have all of these letters to back up my quotes, and if anyone wants to see them, I am delighted to let them have them, or might even submit them for the RECORD, if anyone thinks it is necessary.

I quote from this constituent. He says:

I am tired of having to spend half of my day in the dark just so some soft executive can have a barbecue when he gets home in November.

□ 1430

Another recent letter from Louisville:

Don't tell me it saves lives and energy. I have lived in this world too long to swallow that.

Mr. President, throughout the consideration of this issue, I have always thought that only those individuals in the westernmost portion of a time zone opposed extending daylight saving time. I received a letter recently, however, from Sacramento, CA, which stated:

The pro-daylight-saving-time faction portrays the anti-daylight-saving-time crowd as either a special interest group such as farmers or religious extremists who don't want 'God's Time' tampered with. This is hardly the case. I have no desire to get up in the dark so candy manufacturers can make money off of Halloween sales.

I realize that the amendment of the Senator from Washington only extends daylight saving time during the month of April, but these letters were written before his amendment was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am very concerned that if this amendment passes the Senate—and this is a real concern of mine—the conferees will agree to the House-passed daylight saving time bill, which provides for 3 weeks in the spring and 1 week in the fall.

What we pass here, in the Senate, could well be the final package. On the other hand, it may not be, because the House has a different piece of legislation, the Senate has a different piece of legislation. That bill goes to conference and the conferees will then send back to the Senate what could be a very different piece of legislation.

Mr. President, the principle of daylight saving time is very simple: During part of the year, the sun rises before most people do. If a clock is advanced, sunrise by the clock will be later as sunset will be later. This clock shift does not increase the amount of daylight but it, so-called, saves daylight. It reduces the number of daylight hours when people are asleep and adds the hours when they are awake in the evening. Kentucky's dilemma derives in part from its location. Half of the State is in the eastern time zone and on the western edge of the eastern time zone. Dawn comes in the home State of the distinguished Senator from Maine on the Atlantic coast, which is in the same time zone, a lot earlier than it does on the western edge of Ohio and the eastern part of Kentucky and in our major metropolitan area.

I was very interested in the findings in the proposed amendment. Let me tell my colleagues what this amendment says that Congress will find and what they approve if this amendment is passed. As I say, I think it is very interesting.

This amendment says: "The Congress finds: First, that various studies of governmental and nongovernmental agencies indicate that daylight saving time over an expanded period would produce a significant energy savings in electrical power consumption."

I shall debate that item just a little bit later and prove that it is not really true. A significant energy saving—I think whoever drafted this particular amendment was carried away with his verbiage.

Second, "that daylight saving time over an expanded period could serve as an incentive for further energy conservation by individuals, companies, and the various governmental entities at all levels of government, and that such energy conservation efforts could lead to greatly expanded energy savings."

When you go to work in the dark, you have to turn a light on and when it is cool in the morning, you have to have the heat up. I shall debate that a little bit later.

Third, this amendment says that Congress finds "that the use of daylight saving time over an expanded period"—what is an expanded period? Is it just 3 weeks this year or is it 3 weeks next year and next year and next year? Is that the expanded time this amendment is talking about?

It says, "the use of daylight saving time over an expanded period could have other beneficial effects on the public interest, including the reduction of crime, improved traffic safety, more daylight outdoor playtime for the children and youth of our Nation, greater utilization of parks and recreation areas, expanded economic opportunities through the extension of daylight hours to peak shopping hours and through extension of domestic office hours to periods of greater overlap with the European Economic Community."

That means they are saying that you can stay at work a lot longer; you do not have to go home. I suggest that the effects of the benefits of extended daylight saving time are exceedingly small and therefore hard to assess.

I want to make this one very important point: That the effect of daylight saving time is basically regional. It does not benefit the total country.

Mr. President, there is no hard evidence to convince Kentuckians or those citizens residing on western edges of a time zone that more daylight saving time will save energy, prevent traffic accidents, deter crime, or virtually any of the wondrous things that are claimed by the advocates of the extended daylight saving time.

There are particular hardships on areas in the westernmost fringe of a time zone. For example, the eastern half of Kentucky and much of the State of Ohio are in the westernmost part of the eastern time zone, so sunrises occur as much as an hour and 15

minutes later than in the cities on the Atlantic coast. So we are actually robbed. This affects every aspect of life—the way business is conducted, schools are run, personal families. All of these things are affected by the Sun rising an hour earlier on the Atlantic coast than on the western edge of the eastern time zone. You play that against each of the western edges of every time zone.

Let us look at the facts that have been presented in this particular amendment or what they propose. The National Bureau of Standards found no conclusive evidence of a daylight saving time affect on the saving of electrical energy. We have been hearing an awful lot about how much energy is going to be saved, but the National Bureau of Standards found no conclusive evidence that daylight saving time will have a great affect on the saving of electrical energy. In fact, it may cost more on the western edge of a time zone because the light has to go on an hour earlier and the heat will have to be turned on an hour earlier than normal in the dark.

The Department of Transportation report identified a seven-tenths of a percent reduction in traffic fatalities with extended daylight saving time. The Department of Transportation later expanded the benefits to a reduction in fatalities of 1 to 2 percent. The National Bureau of Standards criticized the Department of Transportation for using raw NHTSA data and found no conclusive evidence for a daylight saving time-related decrease in fatalities.

Mr. President, it just does not seem right to this Senator that you can stand up and beat your chest and say so many wondrous things are going to happen because you extend daylight saving time 3 weeks in April. We had so much snow this year in April, the schools were closed, ball games were called off. You could not go to the parks. In fact, you could not drive your car from home to work, the snow was so deep in many parts of this eastern time zone during the first 3 weeks of April.

The Department of Transportation did not take into account that at the time they were measuring traffic fatalities, the country was experiencing a gas shortage.

□ 1440

Think about that. That was not even factored in. You have not heard about that in this grand and glorious amendment to do all things for all people by extending daylight saving time 3 more weeks.

The President and Congress were recommending responses to the shortage. Think about that. Gas rationing was a way of life at the time these facts were taken. The price of gasoline

had doubled at the time these facts were taken. Citizens found other means of transportation since gasoline was so limited, and the Congress at that time enacted the 55-mile-an-hour speed limit.

Now, that is why lives were saved. That is why gasoline consumption was reduced. That is why traffic accidents and fatalities were reduced.

If there was any reduction in traffic fatalities during the extended daylight saving time period, I am certain some of these factors were the cause and not daylight saving time.

The Department of Transportation, however, has admitted in testimony before the House of Representatives that they did not take any of these factors into account in determining that there would be reduced traffic fatalities under extended daylight saving time.

Now, let me repeat that. Let me repeat that because we are hearing a lot about this Department of Transportation study and how great it will be if we extend daylight saving time 3 more weeks.

The Department of Transportation has admitted in testimony before the House of Representatives that they did not take any of these factors, being gasoline shortage, doubling of prices, looking for other means of transportation, and reducing the speed limit to 55 miles an hour, into account in determining that there would be reduced traffic fatalities under daylight saving time.

Now, I think those factors play a greater part than trying to extend daylight saving time by 3 weeks or a month or whatever.

There is one special interest group in this argument I would like to mention and that is the group of children. We have spent a lot of time lately in this Congress and especially in the media on improving education, the plight of missing children, and the need to protect children from all kinds of behavior. Children have a stake in this extended daylight saving time argument. Although the issue of the coalition to extend daylight saving time is purely economic, as I read in *Fortune* magazine several months ago, the children's issue is purely emotional, purely emotional. The coalition's position is purely economic, and they dismiss the plight of our children as purely emotional.

Well, Mr. President, parents in Kentucky do not believe the issue is emotional. Adding an hour of sunlight at the end of the day subtracts one at the beginning of the day and leaves many school-bound children in the dark. Great concern has been expressed about schoolchildren having to start for school before sunrise in many parts of this country. Advocates of extended daylight saving time say the problem can be alleviated by post-

poning the time of day when school begins so that children would not have to travel to school in the darkness. That is an easy way of saying it, just start school an hour later so they can go to school in the same daylight as you had before you extended daylight saving time.

Now, we have that in testimony before the Commerce Committee. During the 1974-75 year-round daylight saving time experiment, 44 percent of the Nation's school districts shifted the beginning of time of school because of the safety factor—safety factor for children, and we had daylight saving time during the same period that is being advocated under this amendment.

Families with schoolchildren will be operating on two time schedules, one for the school and the other one for their employer. When both parents work, which is the case in many homes now due to economic factors, small children will be left at home unattended until the bus runs. In Kentucky, the beginning times for schools vary, but there are a considerable number of children picked up at 6 to 6:15 a.m., and that is a record from the Kentucky Association of School Administrators.

Now, Mr. President, this is an extreme problem in areas where there is great distance in a consolidated school district, where there is court-ordered busing and where there is one school of a district for handicapped students. Think about that. One school in a district for handicapped students, and they have to get on the bus at 6 to 6:15 a.m., in the dark.

The handicapped students are most likely the first bus run. Then the buses return for another run later in the morning. The sponsor of the House version of extended daylight saving time made a point that sunrises in April under extended daylight saving time would be earlier than sunrises in December, January, and February. Isn't that a wonderful proclamation. The sponsor suggested that there would be 22 weeks in the school year more dangerous than April 1. My response is why make it any worse? In effect, by adopting this amendment, you will make 26 weeks dangerous in the school year rather than 22. The importance of the safety of children is at issue and far exceeds any economic consideration in the extension of daylight saving time debate.

During the hearings on extending daylight saving time held by the Commerce Committee, I was told by one of my colleagues that Kentucky should start schools later to relieve the safety concern. I raised the issue of working parents on a different schedule, and I was told to start the factories 1 hour later.

Mr. President, it was almost hard to believe what I was hearing. If it both-

ered the schoolchildren, start school an hour later. If the children were left home by themselves to wait for the bus, just open the factories 1 hour later, so we would be right back where we started and we ought to leave it alone.

I believe you have to look at this issue in terms of the entire country. If the westernmost areas of a time zone have to make such sacrifices, is extended daylight saving time good for the entire country?

□ 1450

I have also been told by the daylight saving time coalition that the simple answer to Kentucky's problem is to move the entire State into the central time zone. I also believe that this is too great a sacrifice for my citizens to make in order for the coalition to sell more of their products. One of the greatest benefits Kentucky and other States in the region have in attracting industry is that we are on the same time as Wall Street and the financial world. One should not underestimate the business interest of remaining on the same time as the financial world, particularly New York.

In essence, extended daylight saving time would establish a new entitlement system for energy usage. The increased use of energy in mid-America would neutralize the saving of energy on the coasts. Daylight comes over an hour later in Louisville than on the east coast so consumption of energy would be actually increased as people get up earlier, go to work earlier, and turn on their lights and heat earlier. The President of a large utility in Kentucky has indicated that in his judgment extended daylight saving time would mean an additional use of gas and electricity in the mornings without an offset saving in the evening.

Savings in energy, although predicted to be 100,000 barrels of oil per day by the Department of Transportation study, are difficult to isolate from seasonal variations, rate for crude, and fuel availability. The benefits of energy savings are for the coastal States at the expense of the Midwestern States.

Now, Mr. President, a new entity comes into the opposition to the extension of daylight saving time. The National Association of Broadcasters has written in opposition to the extension of daylight saving time. The National Association of Broadcasters' concern is the effect the amendment would have on daytime-only AM broadcast stations. There are 2,450 daylight AM stations in the United States. The impact would be the worst for the approximately 450 daylight stations not holding a presunrise authorization known as PSA.

The monthly sign-on time for a daytime station is based on the time of the local sunrise rounded off to the nearest 15-minute interval. The authorization is expressed in nonadvanced standard time which, in effect, is local time for the 6-month period in which daylight saving time is not observed. During the expanded period in this amendment, the sign-on time for daytime stations not holding a PSA would be delayed 1 hour. Most daytime only stations would suffer a financial loss due to the loss of an hour of drive time.

How much economic benefit has been lost by these small radio stations? No one has brought that into being here. No one has talked about those small radio stations that struggle for a living. Yet this extension of daylight saving time would cost them dearly.

Most daytime only stations would suffer a tremendous financial loss due to that loss of 1 hour in drive time. The morning drive time is the period according to the FCC, Federal Communications Commission, in which stations earn a substantial bulk of their advertising revenues. Four hundred and fifty stations are going to lose an hour of drive time, and that is that bulk of their advertising revenues. So that is another financial loss to be imposed upon citizens, and it is now a fact of life that the National Broadcasting Association is very much opposed to this amendment.

The amendment of the Senator from Washington contains a provision to allow the Federal Communications Commission to make adjustments by rule. This is very technical and the question is what adjustments will be made? What adjustments will be made? It will certainly disrupt the current balancing between full-time and daytime-only AM stations.

As proved by the recent snowstorms in the Rocky Mountains, even in April schools may close due to weather conditions. Most of the radio stations—think about this now—giving this information are daytime-only stations. What would happen? They would not be there and would not be allowed to be on to give that information because of this amendment.

Since the news media has chosen to give me complete credit for opposing extending daylight saving time, I have heard from citizens all over the country. These citizens are firmly opposed to this extending daylight saving time and many come from areas that, due to geographical location, should most likely support sunshine in the evening. These citizens do not have a public relations firm to lobby on their behalf; they do not have a financial interest in the matter nor are they interested in whether some businesses will sell more of their products. They have written

to me and hopefully to their Senators in opposition to this amendment.

From South Pittsburg, TN, Mrs. Marie Daniel wrote me and stated:

I want you to know I sure do appreciate you keeping that bill from extending daylight saving time to 2 more hours. I wish they would leave the time on standard time. The real working people don't have time to play like these men who want more hours of light.

Phillip A. Lomax of Pensacola, FL, wrote:

I want to thank you for opposing the useless Daylight Saving Time extension. My experience with saving time has been as a parent of young children. It was more difficult getting them in from play for a family meal together with adequate time left for homework. I also found it more difficult getting up as early as I needed for a good start on the day. I think the proposal is counterproductive and its passage would only lead to a request for another extension later.

Helga Larson from Bement, IL, informed me:

I read in the paper that you were against extending daylight saving time. That is fine—so am I. It would suit a lot of us fine to do away with it completely.

From Columbus, Ohio, a citizen wrote:

You are admired! And by a Republican at that! Will you please keep that ten year effort to lengthen our daylight hours bottled up another decade or two? Has just one of those daylight saving backers ever tried putting a 4-year-old, a seven-year-old or a ten-year-old to bed at 9:00 in the daylight? I doubt it! Have they ever looked at these same kids in school the next day? These same kids have to get up at the same time having gone to bed an hour or two later. Being a school parent, now you try teaching them! They are just plain tired. I believe with all my heart that this daylight saving time is just one more wedge driven into the family circle. With so many parents working, we don't need more ways to split our times together. Indeed, it is God's time. We need to use it wisely. Our children are watching.

Van Statham from Tyler, TX, wrote me to explain:

I appreciate your stand on the daylight saving time thing. Would think there are so many other important things that need handling, that these guys would not be trying to help the sporting goods companies. Let's leave God's things alone.

(Mr. COCHRAN assumed the Chair.)

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, on April 7, 1986, I received a letter from Violet Clausen of Stapleton, NE.

It was with great delight that I read an article in my daily paper today that thanks to you, those who would enforce their ridiculous daylight saving time for another month of use, were thwarted in their efforts.

From Youngstown, OH, Mrs. Evelyn Carver wrote:

Thank you very much for your efforts about daylight saving time. I don't like it and I don't need it. It should start on May 31 and end September 1, or do away with it completely. We have enough pressures on our shoulders without chasing the clock all day long.

On April 7, Mrs. Verna Palmer of Moss Point, MS, sent a letter which stated:

I appreciate your stand on daylight saving time. I think it is silly for grown men to waste their time and taxpayers' money with nothing better to do than change the time for the sun to rise and set. I am an 81-year-old widow and I have seen many sunrises and sunsets in my lifetime. I believe in and respect God's handiwork.

That was Mrs. Verna Palmer of Moss Point, MS.

In this area, Bruce M. Benton contacted me from Gaithersburg, MD:

Please accept my sincere thanks for your successful efforts which have saved us from additional months of daylight saving time. We have more than enough of that already. Fast time becomes more attractive with increasing latitude, which is why only the northern states are agitating for it. With each additional degree of latitude, summer days are a little longer. At the North Pole, one can enjoy 24 hours of sunshine during mid-summer; but in our southern states, fast time forces too many people, including schoolchildren, to begin their active day in total darkness. Any further change in the national schedule should go in the opposite direction, to limit the period to a maximum of three months. Perhaps, as an alternative, we should rearrange the time zones to make horizontal, as well as vertical divisions. Then the northern states could choose to set their clocks ahead permanently, as Indiana and Michigan have already done, without forcing unpleasantness on the remainder of the nation.

Ada McCain of Danville, VA, recently wrote:

All power to you in prolonging the changing of our time. We people of the USA should have a say so in changing the time and if we did, there would not be any changes made . . . Many times I have seen small children leave home in the dark to stand at some specific place to wait for the bus. This is enough to vote to leave the changing of time alone.

From Rock Rapids, IA, Darlene McMaster informed me:

Thank you very, very much for holding back daylight saving time. Natural biological rhythms are thrown off. The sun in the morning makes it easier to get up, safer to drive to work on the highway. Soon, with DST, it will be dark again when I get up at 6 a.m. How is it that Representative Markey gets to sleep so late that the sun bothers him? He must work a short day.

I just want to make a short statement here. I have a lot more to go and I even have some letters from your State, I say to the Senator, and I am going to quote those, too. There are many in your State that are very much opposed to this, and I am referring to the distinguished Senator from Washington.

But Representative MARKEY sent a letter out the other day indicating that the Cubs and the Pirates, I believe, were locked in an 8-to-8 tie at Wrigley Field and they had to call the game in early April because of darkness. He thought that with extended daylight saving time they could have

played the rest of the ball game, maybe.

But he forgot to tell us that Wrigley Field is the only field in the American or National League that does not have lights so they could continue to play. And he forgot to tell Congress to mandate that the Cubs have better pitching so they could reduce the hits of the Pirates or we forgot to mandate that the Pirates get more hits so they could beat the Cubs. That is how silly this daylight saving time is becoming.

Mr. President, I have letter after letter, and recommendation after recommendation, and I have some letters, as I said, both from the distinguished Senator's State of Washington and probably I could find one if I dig a little deeper from Maine and some of these other strong advocates of daylight saving time, from those who had to spread the sand and the salt in early April in the dark, and if it had been daylight saving time even worse, as we had the blizzards and the snow and the children could not go to school.

So for now, Mr. President, I yield the floor to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska who would like to have a few moments.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I have been listening with great interest to the excellent presentation by my friend and colleague from Kentucky. I think he has said most of the things that need to be said in this area. But I want to add my voice of support to the Senator from Kentucky in opposition to the further extension of daylight saving time.

In this regard—and to digress for just a moment, Mr. President—I would like to thank my colleagues for the agreement that I understood had been entered into that I have been strongly in support of, and that is to not bring up an amendment at this time with regard to scrambling of cable television signals until we can have an opportunity to have a hearing on that in the Commerce Committee, on which the distinguished Senator from Washington, the Senator from Kentucky, and I serve. I have some serious reservations about how fast we move on this, but move we must.

I think here is a place where the Federal Communications Commission has not gotten into the act when I think they should be to resolve this problem that is a major concern to those who do not have the availability of cable television. I hope good people working together can come up with a solution to this matter that is going to cause an awful lot of difficulty in the future but can be solved, I think, with relative ease by some joint discussion. I hope that our hearings in the Commerce Committee will bring that about.

Getting back to the matter at hand, I agree with the comments that have

been made by the Senator from Kentucky. I want to emphasize the fact that the effect that this could have, might have, and I think will have, the adverse effect on children, should be the primary concern and the real reason why we should turn this down.

What I am saying, Mr. President, is why in the world can we not leave well enough alone? I think the public at large believes that we pass far too many bills or amendments here and in the House of Representatives and that we have at the present time a relatively good and relatively well-accepted daylight saving time period in the United States.

Yes, there have always been those who want to shorten the daylight saving time period. That comes up from time to time. I have not endorsed that effort, by telling those proponents to shorten the daylight saving time, "Leave well enough alone." And I would say to the proponents of the amendment, "Please leave well enough alone." And if and when we come to a vote on this matter, I hope that the U.S. Senate, as a whole, will say, "Enough is enough." Let us not stir up unneeded controversy.

□ 1510

Let us leave the law as it is now, which right or wrong—and I happen to think it is right, and it has been accepted by the vast majority of the people in the United States. I suspect, though, that the very thought of having a few extra minutes to do what one wants to do in the evening might unfortunately persuade this body to approve the amendment. I would simply say to them that they should look at the other side of this issue rather than saying, "Well, I think it is good for me," or "I think this is probably good for certain industries."

I have, Mr. President, a letter from the American Farm Bureau. I think the Senator well knows that I will not dwell on it with no keen disappointment by my friend from Washington, I am sure, and my friend from Maine. I will not dwell on the opposition of agriculture in general to the future broadening of the legal hours for daylight saving time for all of the reasons that are well known, I think, here, and it would serve very little purpose to go into that in any detail.

So the Farm Bureau is opposed to this from the traditional standpoint of agriculture. But agriculture, as has been well demonstrated time and time again, is such an insignificantly small percentage of the people in United States today that probably their feelings will not receive the attention that they should. So I am taking a little bit different tack on this at this time.

I want to quote not from a letter in its entirety, but from one paragraph of this letter that has to do with children. This letter, Mr. President, is

from the American Farm Bureau, and it is signed by Mr. Dean Kleckner, the president, dated May 7. It is addressed to me.

And I ask unanimous consent at this time to have the letter printed in its entirety at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. EXON. President Kleckner says,

The Farm Bureau is concerned about lengthening the daylight saving time period for the following reasons.

I am going to talk primarily about the No. 1 reason that Senator Ford has already touched on in some detail in his previous remarks. But I am quoting from his letter.

Parents are concerned about their children waiting for a bus or walking to school in the dark. Even though the Department of Transportation has a 1976 study to show that there would be no increase in accidents if daylight saving time were extended, no amount of studies can alleviate the concern of parents. With the increased reports about crimes against children and the obvious fact that drivers cannot see as well in the dark, rural people—

Rural people, Mr. President—do not accept those results.

Mr. President, I am not saying that for the mass and the greatest amount of schoolchildren that extending daylight saving time by a month would have a significant adverse effect. But, Mr. President, I am saying that it will have a significantly adverse effect for the rural schoolchildren. Their needs, their education, and their safety should be considered along side of the masses of population centers in the United States.

Mr. President, it is not uncommon in certain rural sections of these United States—yes, indeed, in Nebraska—that some schoolchildren in large geographical areas that represent school districts travel 2 to 3 hours on a bus to get to school and back.

That means, Mr. President, that when you have to get up traditionally before dark, you are getting up in 1 more hour of darkness to start that long trip to school each and every day. I am wondering how many Members of the U.S. Senate would be voting for this amendment if their children or their grandchildren were the ones that had to make the sacrifices, basically to compensate those who want to have a little more time to do what they want for pleasure in the daylight hours of the evening.

Mr. President, I hope that we can come to some kind of an agreement today, probably to have a vote on this sometime tomorrow. I have not had a chance to discuss this at length with Senator Ford. I know requests have been made from this side of the aisle to put off any vote on this until tomorrow. If we can at least have a dis-

cussion on an issue like that, maybe we could come to some resolution of the issue. There may be others besides Senator FORD and myself who have something to say on this. And I believe if there are others, it will work better with their schedules when they get back probably tonight or the first thing in the morning.

Mr. President, I will conclude my remarks at this time by saying that Senator FORD has outlined most of the reasons why there are those of us not supporting this amendment. I hope that our colleagues will recognize the legitimate opposition that we have, and overriding every other consideration is the fact that I do not think it is fair to a substantial number of the schoolchildren in my State of Nebraska, and likewise I am confident that it is not in the best interests of the substantial number of the rural schoolchildren in other States of these United States. And, therefore, when and if it comes to a vote, I hope it is defeated.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT NO. 1

MAY 7, 1986.

HON. J. JAMES EXON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR EXON: Farm Bureau would like to take this opportunity to comment on the effort to extend daylight saving time.

On Thursday, May 8, there may be an attempt to amend S. 2180, the Fire Prevention Act, with a provision which would make daylight saving time begin on the first Sunday in April—three weeks earlier than at present. We are very opposed to any extension of daylight saving time.

Farm Bureau policy regarding daylight saving time states:

"Daylight saving time should be limited to the period between Memorial Day and Labor Day. We oppose efforts to extend the present length of daylight saving time."

Farm Bureau is concerned about lengthening the daylight saving time period for the following reasons:

1. Parents are concerned about their children waiting for a bus or walking to school in the dark. Even though the Department of Transportation has a 1976 study to show there would be no increase in accidents if daylight saving time were extended, no amount of studies can alleviate the concern of parents. With the increased reports of crimes against children and the obvious fact that drivers cannot see as well in the dark, rural people do not accept those results.

2. During the harvest season many farmers must wait until the sun comes out and the dew disappears before they can begin work in the morning. This applies especially to the combining of small grains, soybeans and making hay. If farmers are to continue their church and community activities during the evening, they must quit work earlier by the sun, thereby losing at least one hour of work-time each day. Surely everyone is eager for rural people to participate in community events. Farmers are eager for this to happen, but daylight saving time does impede this ability.

3. About 50 percent of farmers now hold second jobs and would have less daylight in the morning to do morning chores.

Farm Bureau urges you to oppose the extension of daylight saving time. Thank you for consideration of our views.

Sincerely,

DEAN KLECKNER,
President.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the thoughtful statement of my friend, the Senator from Nebraska. And I appreciate the position which he takes, even though I disagree with it. I am particularly taken by the offer, on his part at least, that we should vote on this amendment tomorrow, perhaps at a time certain. It is the view of both myself and the distinguished Senator from Maine, Senator MITCHELL, that that would be appropriate because, as the Senator from Nebraska feels, any others who wish to make statements on this subject should be allowed to do so, and there are Members on both sides of the aisle on both sides of this issue whose convenience would be served by voting tomorrow. So that is the view of this Senator and the Senator from Maine.

I strongly suspect such vote will come about, and in fact, I would be delighted if we were able to reach an agreement to vote.

Mr. President, I have listened with care and with great interest to the positions that are advocated by the Senators from Kentucky and Nebraska.

I doubt, Mr. President, that those positions would have been expressed at all differently were we debating the first attempt to establish daylight saving time during the course of the summer months only, or perhaps were we debating in the middle of the second half of the 19th century the proposition that the United States should adopt four standard time zones.

□ 1520

Exactly the same arguments, I suspect, Mr. President, that were made then, more than 100 years ago, are made today.

The fundamental reasons to add the month of April to the time during which daylight saving time is in effect in most of the United States is one of personal convenience.

No number of individual letters read into the RECORD by opponents of this extension can disguise the fact that on every occasion, in all parts of the country in which scientific surveys of public opinion were taken, the vast majority of the people of the United States favor daylight saving time and favor the extension of daylight saving time.

The most recent of those which has been brought to my attention had a majority of almost 2 to 1 for a 2-month extension of daylight saving time, one which would begin early in

March and end after Halloween, in November.

On almost every occasion the subject has come up for debate in this body, a heavy majority of the Members have voted in accordance with that popular opinion. The distinguished Senator from Maine referred to the fact that in 1976, when the issue last arose, the extension of daylight saving time was approved by a vote of some 70 to 23. That, Mr. President was a longer extension of daylight saving time than in the proposal which is before us here.

The reason is not pure accident. The sponsors of this proposal have attempted to meet every legitimate objection, some which they considered to be not so legitimate, to such an extension by limiting it to April.

The date upon which daylight saving time would begin in April pursuant to this amendment, in every part of the United States of America, has a sunrise which, under daylight saving time, would be earlier, in most cases considerably earlier, than the sunrise which takes place on standard time early in January.

I am reminded in the course of this debate, Mr. President, of two lines from William Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*:

What's in a name? That which we call a rose by any other name would smell as sweet.

In both the States of Kentucky and Nebraska, with an overwhelming opposition, it would seem from the statements of their Senators, to daylight saving time, either extended or perhaps in the summer, we have, nevertheless, a group of people who have chosen to go on daylight saving time 12 months of the year and to call it by a different name.

Over 100 years ago when the United States began a system of standard time, four time zones were created, and they were created with great logic. They were centered on the 75th, 90th, 150th, and 120th lines of longitude, and they were set so that at moderate latitudes, high noon would be near the exact center of daylight hours during most of the year on those particular lines of longitude.

Because time zones would be 1 hour apart, would be 15 degrees of longitude apart, that, of course, would provide, by pure logic, that each time zone extend 7½ degrees of longitude east of that standard line and 7½ degrees west.

By 1918, after 30 or so years of experience with standard time, an act of the Congress of the United States empowered the Interstate Commerce Commission to establish official time zones in the United States, and these four time zones were so established.

The ICC, and more recently the Department of Transportation, have, however, been allowed to move those

time zones lines upon the petitions of various States.

Since 1918, time lines have been moved 32 times to the west and 3 times to the east.

What is the situation, Mr. President, with respect to Kentucky, to take a specific example?

In 1918, the Interstate Commerce Commission established the western boundary of the eastern time zone at the eastern edge of Kentucky. The Commission did so by applying the logic to which I have just referred. All of Kentucky, including its most easterly sections, are closer to the 90th meridian, which is the center of the central time zone as I have described it, than it is to the 75th meridian of longitude, which is the eastern time zone.

And yet that boundary has been moved westward at the request of Kentucky in 1927, again further west in 1947, again in 1960, and again in 1961. It was moved back in 1974 at the request of Kentucky, and then moved back westward once again 1 year later to its 1961 location where it has since remained.

That means that the people and the government of Kentucky have, in essence, preferred to be on daylight saving time for 12 months of the year, as long as they can call it eastern standard time.

The same thing holds true with respect to almost the entire State of Nebraska. Most of it, under a national frame of reference which would have the center of the central time zone at 90 degrees west longitude and the mountain time zone at 105 west longitude, ought to be in the mountain time zone. Because the people of the State presumably did not like to waste so much daylight at dawn and wanted more of it in the afternoon, the great bulk of the State of Nebraska is in the central time zone where they spend 12 months of the year on mountain daylight saving time but call it central standard time.

Unfortunately, the State of Maine, represented by the distinguished cosponsor of my amendment, has been effectively unable to do that and move into what is called the Atlantic time zone because it would create a fifth time zone in the United States and a tremendous amount of difficulty. In fact, if the same rule or the same custom were to take place in Maine and the rest of New England, all of New England, following the precedent of Nebraska and the precedent of Kentucky, would have long since gone onto Atlantic standard time rather than eastern standard time.

□ 1530

So every difficulty and every objection which the two opponents to this extension have raised to this point has been settled against the case they make by the people of their own

States as long as 60 or 70 or 80 years ago. Those people, or most of them, have decided that they prefer what is in effect daylight saving time all year long—whatever that may do to traffic safety, whatever it may do to the consumption of energy, whatever it may do to convenience stores, whatever it may do to schoolchildren going to school in the dark.

My distinguished friend, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Ford], complained about various students who are picked up between 6 and 6:15 in the morning during darkness and the great danger to which they are subjected, that we should not extend daylight saving time to the month of April because those children would simply then, presumably all alone during the course of the year, be required to wait for schoolbuses in the dark. Assuming, however, Mr. President, that there is a reasonable amount of light 30 minutes before sunrise, those students now go to school or are picked up by their buses in the dark from the day school begins, right after Labor Day in Louisville, KY—literally the day it begins right after Labor Day—through at least the middle of March.

Apparently, the school districts of Kentucky have not chosen to change the hours of the beginning of school on that account, because under present time conditions, 6 o'clock in the morning is dark in Louisville, KY, from the day school starts through at least the middle of March, if not beyond that period of time. Apparently, the concern for schoolchildren's safety is not so great in either Kentucky or Nebraska that those States wish to put themselves in the time zone to which geography—if geography were the only consideration—would assign them.

Mr. President, it may sound as though I am critical of the choices of the States of Kentucky and Nebraska in that respect. In fact, I am not; I am not critical at all. What those States have done has been to choose the time zone which is most convenient for most of the people who live in those States. It is that and nothing more. What this amendment proposed to do is choose a time regime for the great majority of the people of the United States which is most convenient for most of them and is most suited to most of them. There simply is not a single survey of public opinion on this subject which does not overwhelmingly favor an extension of daylight saving time, not only into the month of April but into the month of March as well. The argument that, somehow or other, there will be an artificial darkness to which most people object during the 3 weeks in April if we have daylight saving time during those 3 weeks simply fails to jell.

Again, to take Kentucky, in every place in Kentucky or, for that matter, in Nebraska, sunrise will be more than half an hour and up to 1 hour earlier on daylight saving time in mid-April than it is in early and mid-January under standard time under present circumstances. That is true all across the country. The differences are slightly smaller in the deep South and slightly greater in the most northerly parts of the lower 48 States of the United States but, during April, daylight is more than 12 hours from sunrise to sunset in every place in the Northern Hemisphere. In early January, it is much, much less than that in every part of the Northern Hemisphere.

The inevitable result is a displacement of the clock to 1 hour later and during the course of the day a sunrise time that is earlier in mid-April than it is in January, much earlier than it is in daylight saving time during the month of October at the present time—something to which everyone in the United States who is on daylight saving time has become accustomed and for a change of which there is very, very little demand.

In fact, the studies of the effect on traffic safety are conclusive, Mr. President; we are not here speaking of safety or reduced traffic accidents simply because we were in an energy crisis or went to a 55-mile-an-hour speed limit. We are talking about statistics which are based on traffic accidents and traffic deaths per million miles driven. Of course, as more miles are driven, there will be more accidents and as fewer miles are driven, there will be fewer accidents. The point is, there are fewer accidents during daylight hours per million miles driven and there are more miles driven in the early evening than there are in the early morning. Therefore, deaths, injuries, and property damage are less under daylight saving time per million miles driven than at any other period of time.

If this body were faced with the inevitable proposition that we would save lives, even a modest number of lives—one-half of 1 percent, one-quarter of 1 percent—by the investment of several, perhaps many millions of dollars, we would almost certainly spend that money, Mr. President. Here we have a chance to save those lives, those injuries and that property damage without spending any of the taxpayers' dollars at all and we should clearly do so. In fact, Mr. President, it is very clear that from the point of view of traffic safety—schoolchildren, nonschoolchildren, and adults alike—there will be a net gain on that safety factor from this change.

It is also, of course, clear that the best argument, because it is the most emotionally appealing argument against this proposal, is the myth of

the schoolchildren's danger in waiting for that school bus in the dark. Yet no individual Member of this body and no State has compensated for that asserted danger by attempting to see to it that schoolchildren not wait in the dark for their school buses in January, in November, in March, or in any other such month. The conclusion I draw from that, Mr. President, is that it is simply not demonstrably a major factor relating to safety itself.

We have a situation, in any event, in which any State that wished not to take advantage of this change could, by petitioning the Department of Transportation, opt exactly as two States already have—the States of Arizona and Indiana, each of which has chosen not to go on daylight saving time at all, with the exception of a small portion of Indiana which is in the central time zone. That is an option for those who feel that the majority of the people in their States do not favor daylight saving time, simply that they not go on it at all, not just in the first 3 weeks of April but during any part of the year whatsoever.

The argument in favor of this proposal, Mr. President, to summarize it, very simply is that it meets with the desires and the felt needs of most people of the United States. They demonstrate that not only by their responses to public opinion surveys but by the very way in which they have set the time zone lines.

□ 1540

Except in New England, there is not one person in the lower 48 States of the United States, Mr. President, who lives in a place 7.5 degrees of longitude to the east of the center of a time zone as established in 1918, who is on that same time zone. Instead, time zones have been moved westward to move these people into time zones to the east. It is simply that these people who think they abhor daylight saving time in fact like it so much that they want to be on it all year as long as they can call it standard time.

That kind of privilege is the privilege which for 3 extra weeks of the year the Senator from Maine would like for his constituents. It is a privilege which I would like for the constituents of much of my State which lies east of one of these standard meridians. It is a privilege which at least two-thirds, of the people of the United States, wherever they are located in a time zone, would like for themselves.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Mr. FORD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I will not take much time. I do not know how long we are going to stay in this afternoon. I understand the distinguished Senators agreed that tomorrow would

be a good time to vote. it might be, but I have not agreed to that yet.

The distinguished Senator from Washington uses two words. He uses all this latitude and longitude and meridian and that sort of thing. Most people do not understand that. Most people understand the Sun coming up in the morning and going down in the afternoon. They understand going to work in the morning and coming home in the evening. They understand their children going to school in the morning and coming home in the afternoon. They understand those things because they are a reality.

He talks about artificial time. That is exactly what he is doing. He is creating artificial time. I do not understand saying that the only issue, because it is emotional, happens to be children. I thought they were important in what we were trying to do.

Then he talks about myth, the argument in opposition to daylight saving time is just a myth; it does not mean anything. Well, you tell that to the family in Louisville, KY, with the boy who was walking to school, crossed the street in the dark, and fell in a manhole and drowned. That was going to school in the dark. Then he talks about only in the middle of March and now it is all the time there would be more light going to school. Well, he would deprive us of those 6 weeks. He would still want us to continue, if his facts were right, sending our children to school for 6 extra weeks in the dark.

He says two-thirds of the United States wants this particular amendment. I do not know whether that is true or not and I do not refute his facts and figures. That just leaves one-third of us who are against it. That is important. You begin to think about agriculture a little bit. We think about the farmers.

Well, there is a feeling around this town of Washington, DC, USA, that farmers do not mean much politically; they are only 2 percent of the voting population, and we do not have to worry about them at all.

Well, that is partly true, I guess, but the farmers in my State are important. They work by the Sun. You cannot change that. You can change time that he has to do business in town. That jeopardizes his efficiency. The farmers in this country are having a hard enough time now. If he is working by the Sun and machinery breaks down and he wants to go to town to get it fixed but they are on an extra hour of daylight, they have already closed the doors and gone. So he waits until the next day. He loses that day. That is not a myth, Mr. President. That is artificial time. The farmers and the children are extremely important. So when you talk about artificial time, that is what the distinguished Senators from Washington

and Maine are trying to do. The myth is really not a myth. It is reality.

Even the distinguished Senator from Washington, as he debates this issue, admits he will put the schoolchildren in Louisville, KY, in the dark 6 weeks longer in the morning. He said we have had it the rest of the year, why not 6 more weeks.

Well, ask that family that lost a child. Emotional? Sure, it is emotional, but it is factual. There is no myth about that. The problem could be artificial time.

I appreciate the press giving me so much print on this particular item. They are crediting me with being about the only one who is standing in opposition to this amendment on daylight saving time.

Well, it is giving me more credit than I deserve, but I know I have been getting a lot of letters. Out of the whole stack of letters that I have received in my support, only two have chastised me and those letters were from Reston and Annapolis, right here in this big bureaucratic bowl of the United States.

I am vocal in my opposition, but, Mr. President, there were enough Senators on the Commerce Committee where this amendment and this piece of legislation should have been discussed and voted on and sent to the Senate floor in the normal procedure, but something has happened on that committee that they failed to vote it out. In fact, it has been on the agenda several times to vote on it and it has been pulled down, pulled off the agenda of the committee, and therefore has been bottled up, as they say, in the Commerce Committee.

Now they have taken the tack on this piece of legislation of adding the amendment extending daylight saving time. But I assure those who are supporting this amendment I do not stand alone. I am not sure how the votes will go. I am not a vote counter. I am not one who gets his little book out and starts calling Senators and checking them off and putting them on the spot. I just try to practice my case, if I can use that phrase, not being a lawyer, and hope that I make some common sense, and that common sense will prevail in this Chamber.

Let me just give you an idea of where some of the citizens are located who have written to me supporting my position and opposing this amendment.

□ 1550

I have had letters in opposition to DST from Sioux Falls, SD; Branchland, WV; Mount Dora, FL; Natrona Heights, PA; New Market, TN; Rochester, NY; Griffin and Atlanta, GA; Suquamish, WA; Chicago, IL; Philadelphia, PA; Muskegon, MI; Dickinson, TX; Miami FL; Midland, TX; Bartles-

ville, OK; Riverhead, NY; Edmond, OK; Blacksburg, VA; Aurora, CO; and Troutdale, OR.

These citizens had no idea who I was, but have written to me united in the opposition to extending daylight saving time.

One of my favorite letters is several years old and from the Northwest, but I especially like the letter from Mrs. Charmond S. Adkins and her arguments:

Please continue to oppose the daylight saving time extension. I'm not a farmer, nor member of any other group opposing it. I'm just an individual who doesn't like DST period. But, if I have to tolerate six months every year surely those who like it can get along without it six months every year. That way everybody gets an equal dose. Thank you and hang tough!

But it does seem like it is fair—6 months on daylight saving time, 6 months off. When you talk to most of the farmers, they like for it to start Memorial Day and end Labor Day. They have a reason for that. It is the way they make a living, by the Sun.

When you really take a close look at this amendment, you realize that the benefits of extending daylight saving time are outweighed by its liabilities. The April period which would be extended by this amendment is not the same as daylight saving time in September as many advocates of extended daylight saving time proclaim. In many parts of the country, it is still very cold in April and just recently the Midwest experienced a major snowstorm during the time that this amendment would extend daylight saving time, and major league baseball games were postponed not because of daylight or darkness but because of snow and snowstorms.

I can understand the position of the advocates of extended daylight saving time. The 9-to-5 worker would have longer to mow the lawn or swat a tennis ball after work. What the advocates fail to realize is that not everyone in this country has a 9-to-5 job. If the Senate agrees with the sponsor of this amendment and extends daylight saving time, there would be undue hardships for farmers and the agricultural community which require natural light. Asphalt and construction companies, moving and storage companies, and warehouses also depend on the natural light of day for their work.

Kentucky will be one of the States which will find extended daylight saving time disruptive. The sponsors of this amendment argue that under existing law, any State that wants to can exempt the State from extending daylight saving time. That is certainly a possibility particularly in the 12 States that are split by time zones. If rural States opt out of daylight saving time altogether, the benefits of the present daylight saving time schedule would be completely lost.

Sure, you have the privilege of opting out but then if you opt out, you lose all of the advantage of the 6-month period.

Is this what we really want—a remedy which will cause a patchwork quilt of time zones? Any business concerned with time schedules, an example is the airlines, would be terribly burdened if the States exercised this option.

For citizens of Washington, DC, and the Members of the Senate who are at least part-time residents of this area, and those portions of the country near a standard meridian, extended Daylight saving time would be very beneficial. The choice must be made with consideration given to the entire population. I suggest that the Senate and each Member weight the liabilities to his or her State, mainly rural citizens, when the time comes to vote on this amendment, and it may be a little while before that time arrives.

I sincerely believe that if the Senate passes extended daylight saving time, it sends a message to middle America, particularly rural areas, that we have given up on rural America.

I would like to allow those citizens on the east coast and the chairman's State on the west coast the opportunity to have an extra hour of daylight in the evening for recreational activities. Unfortunately, by allowing another month of daylight saving time for the east and west coasts, we create more hardships for individuals in the Midwest.

As I said earlier, Mr. President, times are hard enough in largely agricultural States and if we increase daylight saving times, it is just another blow to these citizens.

I am more than willing to debate somewhat longer but for the moment, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I am very pleased to join with my distinguished colleagues, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON], the senior Senator from California [Mr. CRANSTON], the junior Senator from California [Mr. WILSON], and the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MITCHELL] in sponsoring this amendment to advance daylight saving time in future years to begin the first Sunday in April. At present, daylight saving time begins the last Sunday in April and ends the last Sunday in October.

As my colleagues are aware, the House of Representatives recently voted a longer extension of daylight saving time under H.R. 2095. This bill would begin daylight saving time the first Sunday in April and end the extension on the first Sunday in November. Recognizing the genuine concerns of several of my colleagues from rural and farming areas, this amendment offers a reasonable compromise to rural concerns while responding to equally important interests of our constituents living in the urban areas.

Mr. President, I, for many years, have been an advocate of daylight saving time, preferably on a year-round basis. I was particularly pleased during the early 1970's at the height of the energy emergency, that Congress voted on legislation similar to a measure that I introduced, to extend daylight saving time for an 8-month period. That 2-year experiment, beginning 1973 through 1975 was widely recognized as one way to help ease the demand for electricity among residential consumers.

While the concerns over energy shortages and gasoline lines have abated, the importance of continuing public awareness of energy conservation has never been questioned. Daylight saving extension along with the continuation of the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit, remind us of our need to maintain conservation and not to become overly dependent upon foreign oil imports.

Mr. President, expanded daylight saving time is important for many other reasons—all linked to noticeable and immediate improvements on the quality of life for all Americans. These direct benefits include reductions in traffic accidents and fatalities, reductions in street crime and additional leisure time.

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, for example, predicted there would be significantly fewer traffic fatalities per year if the observance of daylight saving time was extended to include the month of April. In this regard, and in response to the very important concern over schoolchildren waiting for school buses in the early morning hours, studies by the Department of Transportation and the National Bureau of Standards have indicated that during the 2-year experiment in the mid-1970's, there were no school age fatality increases during the months daylight saving time was observed, March and April of 1974.

The National Safety Council and the Department of Transportation also reported that under extended daylight saving time during the period of the experiment, school age children were not subjected to greater involvement in accidents than the general population in any period of the day.

Another significant benefit from the additional period of daylight would be the nationwide reduction in most categories of crime—a problem of major concern for most metropolitan/urban areas. Recent statistics from the Federal Bureau of Investigation confirm this and clearly indicate an increase in violent crime across the country.

In this regard, I ask unanimous consent that statistics compiled by the FBI and information appearing in USA Today of April 24, 1986, citing the increase by major crime in cities over 100,000 population, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, without question, an extra hour of daylight occurring at a time when most of the work force is enroute home, would discourage criminals from threatening individuals returning to their families.

These facts are strongly supported by a study conducted by the former Law Enforcement Assistance Administration immediately following the 2-year experiment with daylight saving time. The analysis showed considerably less violent crime for the daylight-saving period when compared to similar periods of time.

Mr. President, it seems clear to me from our experiment with expanded daylight saving time in the 1970's, that the benefits of an additional period of daylight saving time far outweigh the continuation of the present 6-month period. Expanded daylight saving time imposes no additional burdens upon individuals and requires no further involvement by the Federal Government. Clearly, favorable action by the Senate would do much to improve traffic safety, protect our citizens, and enhance the quality of life by providing more leisure time with our families.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment advancing daylight saving time to the first Sunday in April. I also want to strongly commend my distinguished colleagues, Senator GORTON, Senator MITCHELL, Senator CRANSTON, and Senator WILSON for their continuing vigorous leadership in working to pass this important legislation.

EXHIBIT 1

[From USA Today, Apr. 24, 1986]

BIG-CITY CRIME ROSE IN 1984-85

Major crimes reported to police in cities over 100,000 population rose 4 percent for 1984-85, according to FBI figures. Reports of crime dropped 3 percent in 1982, 7 percent in 1983 and 2 percent in 1984. Police in the affected cities, noting that violent crime grew 5 percent, blame drugs and economic problems. But the nation's statisticians feel the rise may be insignificant. Total crimes reported by city in 1985, and percent changes from 1984:

City	Crimes	Change (percent)	City	Crimes	Change (percent)
Alabama:			Detroit	149,954	-7.2
Birmingham	28,076	+6.1	Flint	22,354	+0.1
Huntsville	10,877	-4.6	Lansing	9,877	+4.7
Montgomery	10,275	+9.3	Livonia	4,828	+49.8
Arizona:			Sterling Heights	5,199	+13.6
Glendale	10,416	NA	Warren	11,050	+1.4
Mesa	14,158	+30.5	Minnesota:		
Phoenix	82,529	+15.8	Minneapolis	37,977	+20.0
Scottsdale	6,588	+9.1	St. Paul	20,854	-1.4
Spokane	14,861	+9.3	Mississippi: Jackson	13,307	-5.8
Tucson	38,250	+7.4	Missouri:		
Arkansas: Little Rock	18,564	+10.0	Independence	5,328	-1.3
California:			Kansas City	46,616	+2.6
Anaheim	17,571	+2.9	Springfield	9,581	-1.0
Bakersfield	12,921	+5.7	St. Louis	46,843	-0.8
Berkeley	13,199	-2.8	Nebraska:		
Concord	6,508	+2.4	Lincoln	10,785	+10.8
Fremont	6,667	+5.9	Omaha	22,720	+3.9
Fresno	28,821	+6.9	Nevada:		
Fullerton	6,629	+10.3	Reno	10,333	+9.1
Garden Grove	9,321	-1.3	Las Vegas	35,191	+1.1
Glendale	7,405	+0.3	New Jersey:		
Hayward	7,445	+8.5	Elizabeth	8,290	+6.8
Huntington	8,499	-3.6	Newark	38,798	+19.5
Beach Inglewood	8,165	-4.7	Paterson	10,789	+4.4
Long Beach	30,795	+0.7	Jersey City	17,471	+8.3
Los Angeles	294,404	-0.9	New Mexico: Albuquerque	33,158	+5.6
Modesto	9,791	+13.2	New York:		
Oakland	42,824	+3.8	Albany	5,781	+11.6
Ontario	7,759	+3.6	Amherst	2,879	+13.7
Oxnard	7,772	-4.5	Buffalo	24,056	-1.7
Pamona	9,705	-8.0	Grand Rapids	15,870	-1.6
Pasadena	11,279	-0.3	New York	601,467	+0.2
Riverside	15,690	+11.1	Rochester	22,491	-3.3
Sacramento	33,908	+11.2	Syracuse	12,050	+5.7
San Bernardino	15,002	+5.3	Yonkers	9,235	+2.4
San Diego	67,893	+5.5	North Carolina:		
San Francisco	58,590	-2.2	Charlotte	33,087	+1.0
San Jose	40,224	+1.0	Greensboro	9,989	+13.4
Santa Ana	22,459	+1.6	Winston-Salem	10,588	-6.7
Stockton	19,389	+12.5	Raleigh	10,280	+7.6
Sunnyvale	4,004	NA	Ohio:		
Colorado:			Akron	15,134	-3.2
Aurora	16,906	+14.7	Cincinnati	28,533	-2.2
Colorado Springs	21,835	+21.9	Cleveland	43,071	-9.8
Denver	53,234	+2.5	Columbus	43,373	-4.9
Lakewood	10,261	+13.6	Dayton	17,077	-5.8
Pueblo	7,345	+1.2	Toledo	24,934	-5.1
Connecticut:			Youngstown	7,351	+2.2
Bridgeport	15,808	+2.8	Oklahoma:		
Hartford	17,677	-2.7	Oklahoma City	50,059	NA
New Haven	14,495	+10.0	Tulsa	32,846	+3.9
Stamford	6,118	-10.9	Oregon:		
Waterbury	6,887	+8.4	Eugene	8,592	-1.7
District of Columbia	50,075	-6.4	Portland	62,257	+23.9
Florida:			Pennsylvania:		
Fort Lauderdale	21,844	+4.7	Allentown	5,585	-2.3
Hialeah	13,332	+29.6	Erie	5,422	+10.2
Hollywood	11,366	+11.6	Philadelphia	83,667	+1.4
Jacksonville	48,924	+14.7	Pittsburgh	28,931	+15.8
Miami	58,355	+12.5	Rhode Island: Providence	15,321	+2.6
Miami Beach	12,447	+1.0	South Carolina: Columbia	10,099	-6.9
Orlando	16,122	+17.9	Tennessee:		
Saint Petersburg	2,130	+12.6	Chattanooga	13,641	+1.9
Tallahassee	11,013	+31.0	Knoxville	10,837	+10.6
Tampa	41,770	+23.0	Memphis	59,965	+13.6
Georgia:			Nashville	31,863	+2.4
Atlanta	57,505	+18.2	Texas:		
Columbus	9,637	+3.2	Abilene	6,511	+12.0
Macon	7,736	+3.1	Amarillo	10,843	+9.0
Savannah	12,010	-7.2	Arlington	19,634	+32.8
Hawaii: Honolulu	42,048	-5.6	Austin	39,044	+22.7
Idaho: Boise	6,393	+10.8	Beaumont	9,185	+8.4
Illinois:			Corpus Christi	21,311	+8.2
Chicago	277,260	NA	Dallas	129,496	+14.1
Peoria	8,679	-5.8	El Paso	33,697	+11.8
Rockford	12,669	+6.8	Fort Worth	58,858	+17.5
Springfield	8,499	NA	Garland	9,209	+20.2
Indiana:			Houston	155,910	+4.5
Evansville	6,846	-2.5	Irving	12,025	+21.5
Fort Wayne	12,227	-2.6	Laredo	7,978	+12.3
Gary	8,986	-14.6	Lubbock	17,579	-3.7
Indianapolis	29,651	+1.9	Odessa	9,483	+10.8
South Bend	9,593	-1.7	Pasadena	11,279	-0.3
Iowa:			San Antonio	83,591	+10.2
Cedar Rapids	8,085	+6.9	Waco	9,795	+9.7
Davenport	7,029	-1.0	Wichita Falls	8,512	+17.5
Des Moines	19,899	+13.6	Utah: Salt Lake City	19,037	+7.7
Kansas:			Virginia:		
Kansas City	14,451	-8.2	Alexandria	7,670	+2.0
Topeka	9,277	+9.8	Arlington	7,781	+2.4
Wichita	21,751	+0.1	Chesapeake	5,112	+4.2
Kentucky:			Hampton	7,094	-4.2
Lexington	13,905	+5.0	Newport News	7,301	-7.4
Louisville	16,814	+1.6	Norfolk	18,427	-0.9
Louisiana:			Portsmouth	6,255	+3.4
Baton Rouge	31,279	+28.8	Richmond	17,596	-8.7
New Orleans	48,732	+3.7	Roanoke	8,130	+1.7
Shreveport	20,366	+5.2	Virginia Beach	15,889	+8.1
Maryland: Baltimore	66,121	+1.2	Washington:		
Massachusetts:			Seattle	63,102	+12.6
Boston	67,595	+6.4	Tacoma	21,002	+9.8
Springfield	7,923	-27.0	Wisconsin:		
Worcester	11,701	+13.8	Madison	12,359	+0.3
Michigan:			Milwaukee	43,944	-8.2
Ann Arbor	9,193	-4.6			

Source: FBI.

Offenses Known to the Police, 1985 and 1984
Cities over 100,000 Population

	Medi- Crime Index	For- cible rape	Rob- bery	Aggra- vated assault	Bur- glary	Lar- eny theft	Motor vehic- cle theft	Arson
TX 1984	5,813	5,823	85	155	1,526	3,592	356	10
TX 1985	6,511	6,516	136	166	1,716	3,917	417	23
OH 1984	15,638	15,506	19	215	3,399	9,500	917	266
OH 1985	15,134	15,300	17	210	3,197	9,126	938	220
MT 1984	2,100	2,023	1	10	1,752	7,089	575	83
MT 1985	2,100	2,023	1	10	1,752	7,089	575	83
IL 1984	31,632	31,632	28	210	1,752	7,089	575	83
IL 1985	31,632	31,632	28	210	1,752	7,089	575	83
VA 1984	7,521	7,521	6	59	1,752	7,089	575	83
VA 1985	7,521	7,521	6	59	1,752	7,089	575	83
PA 1984	5,256	5,256	4	42	1,752	7,089	575	83
PA 1985	5,256	5,256	4	42	1,752	7,089	575	83
MA 1984	10,918	10,918	22	52	1,752	7,089	575	83
MA 1985	10,918	10,918	22	52	1,752	7,089	575	83
MT 1984	2,533	2,530	1	59	1,752	7,089	575	83
MT 1985	2,533	2,530	1	59	1,752	7,089	575	83
CA 1984	17,951	17,951	16	102	1,752	7,089	575	83
CA 1985	17,951	17,951	16	102	1,752	7,089	575	83
MI 1984	9,618	9,618	1	51	1,752	7,089	575	83
MI 1985	9,618	9,618	1	51	1,752	7,089	575	83
TX 1984	14,784	14,784	18	93	2,000	4,594	3,241	88
TX 1985	14,784	14,784	18	93	2,000	4,594	3,241	88
GA 1984	7,781	7,781	3	50	1,752	7,089	575	83
GA 1985	7,781	7,781	3	50	1,752	7,089	575	83
CA 1984	18,662	18,662	135	632	2,000	4,594	3,241	88
CA 1985	18,662	18,662	135	632	2,000	4,594	3,241	88
CO 1984	14,816	14,816	13	95	1,752	7,089	575	83
CO 1985	14,816	14,816	13	95	1,752	7,089	575	83
Aurora	14,816	14,816	13	95	1,752	7,089	575	83
Austin	14,816	14,816	13	95	1,752	7,089	575	83
TX 1984	31,021	31,021	20	269	1,752	7,089	575	83
TX 1985	31,021	31,021	20	269	1,752	7,089	575	83
CA 1984	19,302	19,302	52	489	1,752	7,089	575	83
CA 1985	19,302	19,302	52	489	1,752	7,089	575	83
CA 1984	12,222	12,388	11	75	1,752	7,089	575	83
CA 1985	12,222	12,388	11	75	1,752	7,089	575	83
MD 1984	6,571	6,571	215	508	1,752	7,089	575	83
MD 1985	6,571	6,571	215	508	1,752	7,089	575	83
Baltimore	6,571	6,571	215	508	1,752	7,089	575	83
Baton Rouge	6,571	6,571	215	508	1,752	7,089	575	83
TX 1984	31,279	31,279	36	126	1,752	7,089	575	83
TX 1985	31,279	31,279	36	126	1,752	7,089	575	83
TX 1984	8,519	8,519	125	371	1,752	7,089	575	83
TX 1985	8,519	8,519	125	371	1,752	7,089	575	83
TX 1984	9,195	9,195	131	340	1,752	7,089	575	83
TX 1985	9,195	9,195	131	340	1,752	7,089	575	83
TX 1984	11,326	11,326	11	40	1,752	7,089	575	83
TX 1985	11,326	11,326	11	40	1,752	7,089	575	83
AL 1984	26,073	26,334	97	283	1,621	4,551	3,044	100
AL 1985	26,073	26,334	97	283	1,621	4,551	3,044	100
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1985	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,834	3,049	54
TX 1984	15,808	15,872	30	57	1,273	3,8		

Erie	PA	1984	33,697	34,265	22	181	993	7,466	8,006	19,209	2,820	568
		1985	4,919	4,954	5	38	200	261	1,482	2,875	257	35
Eugene	OR	1984	5,422	5,461	5	28	192	339	1,152	1,438	268	39
		1985	8,740	8,789	4	59	144	201	1,954	6,076	302	49
Evansville	IN	1984	8,592	8,671	1	41	122	213	2,076	5,749	390	79
		1985	7,020	7,107	15	32	125	471	1,599	4,471	307	87
Flint	MI	1984	6,846	6,919	9	44	116	515	1,604	4,242	316	73
		1985	22,323	22,766	46	249	882	2,611	6,813	10,397	1,520	443
Fort Lauderdale	FL	1984	22,354	22,828	47	285	1,161	2,855	6,144	9,747	1,915	474
		1985	20,864	20,929	39	122	1,116	636	6,450	10,725	1,776	65
Fort Wayne	IN	1984	21,844	21,936	43	108	1,359	713	6,430	11,157	2,024	92
		1985	12,549	12,660	3	90	270	344	1,622	9,376	644	111
Fort Worth	TX	1984	10,527	10,527	81	175	802	546	3,107	1,054	2,762	37
		1985	58,858	59,209	128	463	2,620	3,121	15,873	30,877	5,756	351
Fremont	CA	1984	6,296	6,469	4	35	82	472	1,660	3,693	350	173
		1985	6,667	6,791	3	34	86	491	1,786	3,917	350	124
Fresno	CA	1984	26,950	27,130	34	134	1,066	760	6,367	16,852	1,743	180
		1985	28,521	28,989	46	174	1,233	854	7,500	18,845	1,765	168
Fullerton	CA	1984	6,008	6,036	6	49	107	245	1,431	3,566	544	28
		1985	6,629	6,668	3	33	172	206	1,537	4,162	514	39
Garden Grove	CA	1984	9,446	9,502	8	72	372	431	2,623	5,098	792	56
		1985	9,321	9,368	13	47	401	362	2,662	4,982	854	47
Garland	TX	1984	7,668	7,697	8	71	94	141	206	2,434	5,815	440
		1985	9,209	9,246	5	52	141	206	2,434	5,815	516	37
Gary ²	IN	1984	10,527	10,527	81	175	802	546	3,107	1,054	2,762	37
		1985	8,986	9,743	63	113	598	684	2,491	2,827	2,210	757
Glendale ¹	AZ	1984	10,416	10,526	7	53	118	626	2,677	6,366	569	110
		1985	10,416	10,526	7	53	118	626	2,677	6,366	569	110
Glendale	CA	1984	7,384	7,470	4	32	238	190	2,103	1,975	842	86
		1985	7,405	7,557	4	17	263	195	1,916	3,068	922	152
Grand Rapids	MI	1984	16,133	16,257	19	153	561	1,255	4,206	9,251	648	124
		1985	15,872	15,978	19	219	673	1,303	3,576	9,318	762	108
Greensboro	NC	1984	8,812	8,864	8	56	180	653	1,796	5,805	314	52
		1985	10,049	10,049	13	54	234	703	2,204	6,398	383	60
Hampton	VA	1984	7,406	7,451	10	47	190	595	2,276	2,435	325	45
		1985	7,094	7,137	6	42	141	131	1,047	2,388	269	43
Hartford	CT	1984	18,171	18,399	22	108	1,565	957	4,412	9,523	1,584	228
		1985	17,677	17,914	12	106	1,520	1,066	4,627	8,875	1,471	237
Hayward	CA	1984	8,660	8,608	8	40	172	356	1,663	4,220	401	48
		1985	8,445	8,501	6	36	250	275	1,693	4,610	471	56
Hialeah	FL	1984	10,284	10,334	22	14	433	562	1,961	7,000	1,472	233
		1985	13,352	13,409	44	29	538	767	2,521	6,335	2,318	77
Hollywood	FL	1984	10,186	10,231	6	45	393	474	2,234	6,347	687	45
		1985	11,366	11,404	5	43	479	505	2,395	7,024	915	38
Honolulu	HI	1984	44,500	45,004	25	255	1,117	553	9,320	30,191	3,099	444
		1985	42,048	42,475	36	198	905	42,048	42,475	2,421	427	67
Houston	TX	1984	149,199	151,200	473	1,269	5,157	4,236	38,201	67,038	28,805	2,001
		1985	155,910	157,889	457	1,711	9,589	4,704	40,267	67,496	31,746	1,979
Huntington Beach	CA	1984	8,818	8,857	8	48	194	249	2,518	5,042	759	69
		1985	8,499	8,537	4	38	172	252	2,350	4,916	767	38
Huntsville	AL	1984	11,396	11,454	12	71	247	360	2,484	7,759	463	58
		1985	10,877	10,940	11	73	206	257	2,000	7,454	477	63
Independence	MO	1984	5,400	5,444	7	23	87	220	1,238	3,509	316	44
		1985	5,328	5,371	1	18	79	264	1,134	3,498	334	43
Indianapolis	IN	1984	29,103	29,362	49	324	1,842	2,151	8,163	13,552	3,022	259
		1985	29,651	29,871	59	346	1,795	2,422	8,209	13,927	2,895	220
Inglewood	CA	1984	8,584	8,642	2	101	1,206	573	2,202	2,394	1,760	78
		1985	8,165	8,286	27	106	1,164	594	2,275	6,059	739	107
Irving	TX	1984	9,901	10,008	16	68	184	522	2,273	6,059	739	107
		1985	12,025	12,131	12	82	203	548	2,746	7,603	831	106
Jackson	MS	1984	14,127	14,213	32	138	497	950	4,304	7,443	763	86
		1985	13,307	13,379	38	116	442	603	3,967	7,313	628	72
Jacksonville	FL	1984	42,659	43,027	103	587	2,134	3,404	11,630	22,336	1,865	368
		1985	48,924	49,339	90	705	2,693	3,613	13,064	25,806	2,154	415
Jersey City	NJ	1984	16,135	16,188	32	141	1,758	1,622	4,261	6,077	2,844	53
		1985	17,471	17,566	29	98	4,041	1,203	4,180	6,650	3,270	95
Kansas City	KS	1984	15,742	15,852	23	137	509	1,329	4,600	7,735	1,409	110
		1985	14,551	14,559	23	139	535	1,422	4,058	6,827	1,447	108
Kansas City	MO	1984	45,416	45,848	88	372	2,440	4,267	11,182	22,729	4,318	432
		1985	46,616	47,111	91	424	2,646	4,851	11,164	21,888	5,552	495
Knoxville	TN	1984	9,796	9,907	20	66	281	492	3,192	4,450	1,275	111
		1985	10,837	10,945	16	65	420	579	3,302	4,956	1,499	108
Lakewood	CO	1984	9,029	9,082	2	42	169	389	2,131	5,797	499	53
		1985	10,261	10,321	2	46	190	218	2,438	6,535	570	60
Lansing	MI	1984	9,438	9,538	17	92	180	813	2,383	5,493	460	100
		1985	9,877	9,978	6	75	210	773	2,391	5,998	424	101
Laredo	TX	1984	7,103	7,140	12	35	107	346	2,015	4,205	383	37
		1985	7,978	8,026	15	40	138	407	2,401	4,441	536	48
Las Vegas	NV	1984	34,813	35,274	67	245	1,767	1,230	10,874	17,622	3,008	461
		1985	35,191	35,547	57	278	1,755	1,534	9,975	18,533	3,059	356
Lexington	KY	1984	13,247	13,345	13	89	304	442	2,064	8,428	707	98
		1985	13,905	13,976	7	98	320	743	3,051	8,986	700	71
Lincoln	NE	1984	9,732	9,791	5	78	81	359	1,779	7,151	279	59
		1985	10,785	10,811	7	86	86	428	1,938	7,977	263	26
Little Rock	AR	1984	16,779	16,912	35	169	733	1,353	4,746	8,911	787	133
		1985	18,444	18,626	32	169	715	1,706	4,830	10,146	1,561	162
Livonia	MI	1984	3,223	3,228	2	8	56	98	759	1,653	349	5
		1985	8,828	8,843	3	16	79	161	1,038	2,608	923	15
Long Beach	CA	1984	30,591	30,804	41	242	2,591	1,369	7,892	14,285	4,171	213
		1985	30,591	30,804	41	242	2,591	1,369	7,892	14,285	4,171	213
Los Angeles	CA	1984	297,183	302,303	759	2,347	66,696	128,538	48,507	5,120	1,338	138
		1985	294,404	299,742	777	2,318	27,938	21,799	63,963	125,968	51,641	538
Louisville	KY	1984	16,554	16,763	39	142	1,074	569	4,991	8,748	991	209
		1985	16,814	16,968	30	119	1,266	530	5,019	8,673	1,177	154
Lubbock	TX	1984	18,246	18,463	27	100	341	1,218	6,006	9,680	584	217
		1985	17,579	17,652	20	98	280	1,126	5,679	8,662	716	73
Madison	GA	1984	7,501	7,533	19	86	158	396	1,499	8,935	446	32
		1985	7,736	7,773	16	53	185	354	1,525	9,171	432	37

San Antonio	TX	1984	19,037	19,123	14	99	448	524	23
		1985	75,867	76,426	160	745	2,457	1,826	23,648
San Bernardino	CA	1984	14,249	14,407	32	88	1,092	893	4,361
		1985	15,002	15,156	18	104	1,041	1,086	4,454
San Diego	CA	1984	64,366	64,795	103	393	2,616	2,819	15,248
		1985	67,693	68,273	96	338	3,062	2,819	16,363
San Francisco	CA	1984	59,878	60,230	73	495	5,222	3,582	13,131
		1985	59,878	60,230	73	495	5,222	3,582	13,131
San Jose	CA	1984	39,818	40,211	48	421	1,175	651	9
		1985	40,224	40,738	55	415	1,237	1,763	9
Santa Ana	CA	1984	22,098	22,274	39	74	835	750	6
		1985	22,529	22,610	33	59	865	601	5
Savannah ³	GA	1984	12,992	13,000	59	97	660	325	2
		1985	12,010	12,054	40	130	570	325	2
Scottsdale	AZ	1984	6,037	6,074	3	20	86	141	1
		1985	6,588	6,630	8	18	97	141	1
Seattle	WA	1984	56,019	56,328	50	448	2,386	2,689	14
		1985	61,511	61,562	61	391	2,843	3,179	16
Shreveport	LA	1984	19,356	19,502	29	139	439	973	3
		1985	20,366	20,485	48	125	556	1,021	4
South Bend	IN	1984	9,763	9,787	11	84	315	257	3
		1985	9,593	9,668	9	58	318	281	2
Spokane	WA	1984	15,534	15,589	10	61	280	597	3
		1985	14,861	14,936	9	63	309	557	3
Springfield ⁴	IL	1984	8,499	8,551	4	75	177	480	2
		1985			15		227	507	2
Springfield	MA	1984	10,849	10,978	11	137	442	2,290	2
		1985	7,923	8,008	18	106	379	1,343	2
Springfield	MO	1984	9,489	9,759	13	42	161	370	2
		1985	9,591	9,639	6	54	109	137	2
Stamford	CT	1984	6,866	6,889	8	26	228	149	1
		1985	6,118	6,155	5	16	273	205	1
Sterling Heights	MI	1984	4,575	4,556	1	31	37	211	1
		1985	5,199	5,255	7	19	64	205	1
Stockton	CA	1984	17,234	17,333	29	90	853	525	4
		1985	19,389	19,497	27	91	705	738	4
Sunnyvale	CA	1984	4,005	4,034	2	25	85	84	1
		1985	4,004	4,035	5	29	83	107	1
Syracuse	NY	1984	11,405	11,518	12	67	544	314	3
		1985	12,050	12,163	12	80	542	370	3
Tacoma	WA	1984	15,135	15,256	15	205	689	934	3
		1985	21,002	21,129	13	279	640	1,078	7
Tallahassee	FL	1984	8,406	8,428	4	70	189	542	2
		1985	11,013	11,043	3	12	260	859	2
Tampa	FL	1984	35,955	36,170	52	277	1,432	1,688	12
		1985	41,770	41,963	70	288	2,657	804	12
Toledo	OH	1984	26,268	26,970	34	215	1,095	936	6
		1985	24,934	25,293	27	236	970	926	5
Topeka	KS	1984	6,449	6,499	3	59	216	425	1
		1985	9,277	9,312	6	56	226	403	1
Torrance	CA	1984	6,662	6,709	6	34	230	301	1
		1985	7,178	7,245	4	37	331	265	1
Tucson	AZ	1984	35,616	35,834	25	282	809	1,843	9
		1985	38,250	38,503	33	297	1,051	2,333	9
Tulsa	OK	1984	31,609	31,753	30	246	504	1,439	8
		1985	34,881	35,082	33	268	616	1,489	11
Virginia Beach	VA	1984	14,697	14,842	13	118	235	252	3
		1985	15,889	16,024	17	98	205	231	3
Vaco	TX	1984	8,929	8,966	13	65	219	463	2
		1985	9,785	9,835	8	77	185	521	2
Warren	MI	1984	10,901	11,015	5	49	272	672	10
		1985	11,050	11,059	9	49	272	672	10
Washington	DC	1984	53,524	53,858	175	366	6,087	4,097	10
		1985	50,075	50,369	147	337	5,230	4,457	10
Waterbury	CT	1984	6,352	6,396	4	26	212	204	1
		1985	6,687	6,729	5	35	255	218	1
Wichita	KS	1984	24,725	24,992	12	207	451	658	4
		1985	21,751	21,972	26	249	699	689	4
Wichita Falls	TX	1984	7,244	7,327	15	80	206	309	1
		1985	8,512	8,598	10	64	242	288	1
Winston-Salem	NC	1984	11,347	11,470	23	65	242	318	1
		1985	10,588	10,728	16	77	287	1,509	2
Worcester	MA	1984	10,281	10,449	8	87	524	724	3
		1985	11,701	11,784	6	109	638	768	3
Yonkers ³	NY	1984	9,015	9,082	14	30	594	327	2
		1985	9,235	9,259	23	30	730	203	2
Youngstown ³	OH	1984	7,190	7,215	23	34	234	598	3
		1985	7,351	7,391	21	58	338	936	3

UNIFORM CRIME REPORT
1985 PRELIMINARY ANNUAL RELEASE

The number of Crime Index offenses reported to law enforcement agencies throughout the United States increased 4 percent during 1985 when compared to 1984. The violent crimes of murder, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault increased 5 percent as a group while the property crimes of burglary, larceny-theft, and motor vehicle theft increased 4 percent.

During the first quarter of 1985, the increase was 3 percent over the same quarter of 1984. When comparing the second and third quarters of 1984 and 1985, the increase was 7 percent while the fourth quarter increased 3 percent.

Crime Index trends by population groups and by geographic regions appear in Tables 1-3 below.

TABLE 1 - CRIME INDEX TRENDS
Percent change 1985 over 1984, offenses known to the police.

Population Group and Area	Number of agencies	Population (thousands)	Crime Index total	Modified total	Violent crime	Property crime	Murder	Forcible rape	Robbery	Aggravated assault	Burglary	Larceny theft	Motor vehicle theft	Arson*
Total	13,016	222,182	+4	+4	+5	+4	+1	+4	+3	+6	+2	+5	+6	+3
Cities:														
Over 1,000,000	5	14,848	0	0	+2	-1	+2	+6	0	+6	-3	+1	-4	+6
500,000 to 999,999	17	12,030	+4	+4	+5	+4	-2	+6	+2	+7	+2	+5	+8	+3
250,000 to 499,999	36	13,082	+8	+8	+9	+8	+8	+7	+10	+10	+7	+8	+15	-4
100,000 to 249,999	124	18,066	+5	+5	+7	+5	-1	+1	+6	+9	+3	+5	+10	+4
50,000 to 99,999	298	20,378	+4	+4	+3	+5	0	+2	+3	+3	+3	+5	+9	-4
25,000 to 49,999	641	22,171	+5	+5	+6	+5	+2	+5	+5	+6	+3	+5	+7	+7
10,000 to 24,999	1,578	24,943	+5	+5	+4	+5	+3	+1	+3	+4	+3	+5	+6	+9
Under 10,000	6,256	22,706	+3	+3	+2	+3	+8	-2	0	+3	+2	+3	+7	+8
Counties:														
Suburban	1,245	45,050	+6	+6	+5	+6	-2	+3	+3	+6	+3	+6	+10	+4
Rural	2,816	28,908	+2	+2	+6	+1	0	+9	-4	+7	+2	0	+5	+2

(1) Includes crimes reported to sheriffs' departments, county police departments, and state police within Metropolitan Statistical Areas.
(2) Includes crimes reported to sheriffs' departments, county police departments, and state police outside Metropolitan Statistical Areas.

TABLE 2 - CRIME INDEX TRENDS

Area	Number of agencies	Population (thousands)	Crime Index total	Modified total	Violent crime	Property crime	Murder	Forcible rape	Robbery	Aggravated assault	Burglary	Larceny theft	Motor vehicle theft	Arson*
Total	13,016	222,182	+4	+4	+5	+4	+1	+4	+3	+6	+2	+5	+6	+3
Cities over 50,000	480	78,404	+4	+4	+5	+4	+1	+5	+3	+7	+2	+5	+5	+1
Suburban area	6,127	91,337	+5	+5	+5	+5	0	0	+4	+5	+3	+6	+9	+5
Rural area	2,816	28,908	+2	+2	+6	+1	0	+5	-4	+7	+2	0	+5	+2
Other Cities ³	3,593	23,534	+3	+3	+4	+3	+5	-3	0	+5	+3	+3	+6	+9

(1) Includes crimes reported to city, county, and state law enforcement agencies within Metropolitan Statistical Areas, but outside the core cities.
(2) Includes crimes reported to sheriffs' departments, county police departments, and state police outside Metropolitan Statistical Areas.
(3) Includes crimes reported to city police departments outside of Metropolitan Statistical Areas.

TABLE 3 - CRIME INDEX TRENDS BY GEOGRAPHIC REGION

Region	Crime Index total	Modified total	Violent crime	Property crime	Murder	Forcible rape	Robbery	Aggravated assault	Burglary	Larceny-theft	Motor vehicle theft	Arson*
Total	+4	+4	+5	+4	+1	+4	+3	+6	+2	+5	+6	+3
Northeast	+2	+2	+3	+1	-3	+2	+1	+5	0	+3	-1	+5
Midwest	0	0	+2	-1	+9	+6	-2	+4	-3	+1	-2	-1
South	+8	+8	+8	+8	-1	+6	+7	+8	+6	+8	+16	+1
West	+5	+5	+5	+6	+2	+2	+4	+6	+4	+6	+10	+6

TABLE 4 - CRIME INDEX TRENDS
January through December, each year over previous year.

Years	Crime Index total	Modified total	Violent crime	Property crime	Murder	Forcible rape	Robbery	Aggravated assault	Burglary	Larceny-theft	Motor vehicle theft	Arson*
1982/1981	-3	-3	-3	-3	-7	-5	-7	+8	-9	-1	-2	-12
1983/1982	-7	-7	-5	-7	-8	0	-8	-2	-9	-6	-5	-11
1984/1983	-2	-2	+1	-2	-3	+7	-4	+5	-5	-2	+2	+2
1985/1984	+4	+4	+5	+4	+1	+4	+3	+6	+2	+5	+6	+3

*The Modified Crime Index total is the sum of the Crime Index offenses, including arson. Data for arson are not included in the property crime totals. The number of agency reports used in arson trends is less than used in compiling trends for other Crime Index offenses. It must be noted that the collection of arson data began in April, 1979, with 1980 being the first full year of this data collection.

ISSUED BY William H. Webster, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation
United States Department of Justice, Washington, D. C. 20535
Advisory: Committee on Uniform Crime Records, International Association of Chiefs of Police;
Committee on Uniform Crime Reporting, National Sheriffs' Association

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I am a cosponsor of Senator GORTON's amendment to begin daylight saving time the first Sunday in April. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this measure that will improve the quality of life of millions of Americans.

Under current law, April sunrises are the earliest of the year. The effect of this amendment would be to transfer an hour of daylight from the early morning to the early evening for 3 weeks in April. Americans would then have an extra hour of daylight at the end of the day for safer commuting, for play time for children, for shopping, and for leisure time with their families. For those 400,000 Americans who suffer from night blindness the extra evening hour of daylight will have a very important impact on their lives.

In 1974 and 1975 the U.S. Department of Transportation found that extended daylight saving time reduced electric power consumption, saving 100,000 barrels of oil per day, discouraged violent crime, and reduced traffic fatalities.

An extension would also stimulate business activity. More than 8,300 companies from a wide variety of industries have joined forces as the daylight savings time coalition. The coalition estimates that an extension could generate billions of dollars in additional revenues and lead to the creation of many new jobs.

Those who live on the western edge of a time zone may be concerned that their children would leave for school in the dark. The amendment takes this concern into account by limiting the extension to April. During those 3 weeks in April the Sun would rise and set about the same time it does now in mid-August and early September.

Time is our most valuable but fleeting resource. An extension will enable Americans to use and enjoy their time more fully. And that is why I ask my colleagues to support the extension of daylight savings time to the first Sunday in April.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Washington has in my judgment eloquently and with careful marshaling of the evidence set forth the reasons why this amendment should be adopted by the Senate.

□ 1600

It is not my intention to repeat the statements which he has made. I would like to address just briefly one question raised by the opponents and then insert some material in the RECORD before I conclude.

The opponents argue in opposition to this amendment in part on the grounds that the National Association of Broadcasters opposes an extension of daylight saving time because, ac-

cording to that organization, any change may well affect and disrupt the balancing of interests among AM radio broadcasters. In particular, they object to any amendment in which Congress sets what are known as sign-on times for daytime broadcasters.

I would note, Mr. President, that this amendment offered by the Senator from Washington and myself does not attempt to set sign-on times for daytime broadcasters. It recognizes the Federal Communications Commission's technical expertise in this area and enables the Commission to make any necessary adjustments by general rules consistent with the public interest.

So the basis of the concern by the National Association of Broadcasters has been accommodated by the amendment which gives the FCC that flexibility.

Daytime radio stations begin broadcasting at sunrise and, therefore, they fear that daylight saving time's later sunrises would cut into their morning drive time. However, it should be emphasized that, if this amendment is enacted and becomes law, daylight saving time in April would not subject them or anyone else to sunrises any later than already take place in the fall under the current system.

The Federal Communications Commission already has mitigated the impact of daylight saving time by granting daytimers what is known as presunrise authority in which stations can sign on at 6 a.m. regardless of sunrise time but at reduced power. So I believe, Mr. President, that the concerns of AM radio broadcasters are accommodated in this amendment.

With respect to the question of safety, in 1975, when daylight saving time was being considered by the Senate, the National Safety Council issued a statement based upon a study which concluded that there was no increase in school-age traffic fatalities due to daylight saving time.

On November 11, 1985, the director, Standards and Governmental Relations of the National Safety Council wrote to the Senate Commerce Committee regarding that study, in effect stating that its conclusions were still valid. And I would like to quote briefly from that letter of November 11, 1985, which reads, in part:

The statement summarizes results of two studies the National Safety Council conducted in the early 1970's concerning school child traffic fatalities arising out of changing the daylight saving time cycle. In summary, the studies indicate that extending the daylight saving time cycle would not have any appreciable effect on the number of school age children or pedal-cyclists killed in traffic accidents while going to or from school. We do not know of any other similar studies conducted by any other organization since 1975, nor do we have reason to believe that the results of the Council's studies are not still valid.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that both of these documents be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO INCREASE IN SCHOOL-AGE TRAFFIC FATALITIES DUE TO DAYLIGHT SAVINGS TIME, NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL SAYS

CHICAGO.—Daylight savings time means traveling to school in darkness for many young persons; but according to the National Safety Council, the change in lighting has had little or no effect on the number of early-morning fatalities among school-age children.

"The Council's statistics department surveyed all 50 states and the District of Columbia to determine if there was any increase in the number of school-child fatalities for January, 1974, as compared with January, 1973," NSC President Vincent Tofany explained.

"The survey respondents, who represented 75 percent of our population in 42 states and the District of Columbia, showed no appreciable difference between the two months in the number of early-morning pedestrian and pedalcycle fatalities experienced by children 4 through 18 years old," he said.

According to the Council, 20 traffic fatalities were recorded in January, 1974, among children aged 4 through 18 walking or pedaling during the going-to-school hours from 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. By comparison, 19 fatalities were recorded for January, 1973.

Thirteen of the 20 youthful traffic fatalities in January, 1974, were children under 14 years old, Council spokesmen said. Eleven of the 19 fatalities recorded for January, 1973, were under 14 years old.

Over a 24-hour period, school-age traffic deaths throughout the United States were down from 76 fatalities in January, 1973, to 55 fatalities in January, 1974, the Council reported.

"Of the forty-three reporting agencies, twenty-nine states and the District of Columbia showed either no changes or decreases in the number of school-age fatalities," Tofany said. "Three states—Alaska, Arizona and Idaho—were not included in the survey since they had not shifted over to daylight savings time. Ten states—Florida, Nevada, Virginia, Illinois, New Mexico, Wisconsin, Connecticut, Louisiana, North Carolina and Pennsylvania—had increases in the number of schoolage traffic fatalities."

Of the states with increased fatalities, Florida, according to the Council, showed the biggest increase—up five fatalities in January, 1974, as compared with January, 1973. Council spokesmen said Illinois showed the second largest increase—up four fatalities. Connecticut and North Carolina both showed increases of three fatalities, while the remaining six states reported increases of one school-age fatality each.

NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL,
November 11, 1985.

Mr. CHARLES FAUST,
Senate Commerce Committee,
Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. FAUST: Concerning the issue of the extension of daylight saving time, enclosed is a statement the National Safety Council presented to the Senate Commerce

Committee November 13, 1975 on amendments to the "Uniform Time Act of 1966."

The statement summarizes results of two studies the National Safety Council conducted in the early 1970's concerning school child traffic fatalities arising out of changing the daylight saving time cycle. In summary, the studies indicate that extending the daylight saving time cycle would not have any appreciable effect on the number of school age children or pedalcyclists killed in traffic accidents while going to or from school. We do not know of any other similar studies conducted by any other organization since 1975, nor do we have reason to believe that the results of the Council's studies are not still valid.

Extending the daylight saving time to the first Sunday in November would provide an additional hour of p.m. daylight for the Halloween trick-or-treaters and presumably this may have some minor effect on accidents involving this group.

Sincerely,

ROBERT CURRIE,
Director, Standards and
Governmental Relations.

(Mr. WILSON assumed the chair.)

Mr. MITCHELL. Finally, Mr. President, I would like to quote from a letter dated May 7, 1986, addressed to the majority leader from the Secretary of Transportation, Elizabeth Hanford Dole, who expressed her support for starting daylight saving time earlier in April as contained in this amendment. In part, the Secretary of Transportation's letter reads:

Studies by the Department of Transportation and other agencies of government—Federal, State, and local—plus American industry have shown that this step would reduce deaths, injuries, and property damage on our highways, while making more efficient use of energy and reducing certain types of crime. On the basis of 1983 figures, DST in April would reduce traffic deaths nationwide by a minimum of 22, injuries by a minimum of 1525, and societal costs from auto accidents by a minimum of \$28 million. I emphasize that each of these figures is a minimum, with possible savings being as much as twice as large.

The current law—the Uniform Time Act of 1966—does not require that anyone observe DST, it merely establishes a uniform pattern for each year's observance. The majority of the American people were already observing DST in 1966 because they knew of its advantages. Studies over the last twelve years have consistently shown that the American people want more of these advantages, but are prevented from doing so by Federal law.

I note also that the bill would not push DST into November, and so would not cause uncomfortably late sunrises for any part of the country. It would also not increase the traffic hazard faced by any part of our population, including school-age children.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the letter from the Secretary of Transportation to the majority leader, dated May 7, 1986, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, DC, May 7, 1986.

HON. ROBERT DOLE,
U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR BOB: I write to you today to reiterate my support for starting daylight saving time (DST) earlier in April. This proposal will be considered as floor amendment 1793 to S. 2180.

Studies by the Department of Transportation and other agencies of government—Federal, State, and local—plus American industry have shown that this step would reduce deaths, injuries, and property damage on our highways, while making more efficient use of energy and reducing certain types of crime. On the basis of 1983 figures, DST in April would reduce traffic deaths nationwide by a minimum of 22, injuries by a minimum of 1525, and societal costs from auto accidents by a minimum of \$28 million. I emphasize that each of these figures is a minimum with possible savings being as much as twice as large.

The current law—the Uniform Time Act of 1966—does not require that anyone observe DST, it merely establishes a uniform pattern for each year's observance. The majority of the American people were already observing DST in 1966 because they knew of its advantages. Studies over the last twelve years have consistently shown that the American people want more of these advantages, but are prevented from doing so by Federal law.

I note also that the bill would not push DST into November, and so would not cause uncomfortably late sunrises for any part of the country. It would also not increase the traffic hazard faced by any part of our population, including school-age children.

The bipartisan effort to extend DST deserves your support. Please contact me if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH HANFORD DOLE.

Mr. MITCHELL. In conclusion, Mr. President, I urge the Members of the Senate to vote for this amendment on the grounds that it is a small but commonsense proposal for the benefit of our Nation.

I yield the floor.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Maine has made some statements relating to the reduction of fatalities, probable electricity savings, and so forth, and about daytime radio.

I think it is important that we look at those who are most concerned about the so-called daytime radio stations. I have a letter written on March 12, another one on March 24, and another one on March 19. I would like to read those.

□ 1610

These letters are signed by Edward O. Fritts, president and chief executive officer of the National Association of Broadcasters, and John F. Dille III, chairman of the Radio Board. The letter written on March 12 said,

DEAR SENATOR FORD: It is my understanding that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is scheduled to consider H.R. 2095, or Senate Bill 1433, the Daylight Saving Extension Act of 1985.

This is the Senate bill they refer to that is being tacked onto this bill as an amendment. And this is a line I think that is important.

The National Association of Broadcasters is opposed to this bill. The proposed legislation would seriously impact on radio broadcasters. In order to avoid interference of the AM band, the Federal Communications Commission has struck a delicate balance between various classes of AM radio stations. This involves the use of directional antennas, reduced power levels, and daytime only stations.

Let us go back. The FCC has struck a delicate balance, and this amendment will fracture the delicate balance that has been struck by the Federal Communications Commission.

The Federal Communications Commission has on several occasions in recent years taken action to preserve that balance. Therefore, any change in daylight savings time may well affect and disrupt the balancing of interest among AM radio broadcasters. In particular, any amendment in which Congress sets "sign on" times for daylight broadcasters will harm other segments of the AM radio industry, and place the Congress in the position of usurping the FCC's technical expertise.

How can you expect the FCC to change the delicate balance just because this amendment gives it the authority to do just that? They have already done it. And when you extend daylight saving time for 3 additional weeks, you fracture that delicate balance.

Should the committee take any action, NAB believes the language in section 5 of the House-passed bill is from a policy standpoint the best way to proceed. This will afford all interested parties the opportunity to present their case to the expert agency. Thank you for your attention on this important issue. I look forward to working with you in the future.

Then, again on March 24, both the president and chief executive officer and chairman of the radio board wrote another letter. It says:

DEAR SENATOR FORD: It is our understanding that the proponents of S. 1433—

That is, in essence, the amendment that we are discussing now.

—the Daylight Saving Extension Act of 1985 may by planning to add their bill in the form of an amendment—

Well, that is just exactly what has happened.

—to legislation that will come before the full Senate for consideration in the near future. The National Association of Broadcasters is opposed to this legislation.

They are reiterating their opposition in their letter of March 12 and their letter of March 24.

The proposed legislation would seriously impact on radio broadcasting in order to avoid interference on the AM band. The FCC—

And they reiterate.

—has struck a delicate balance between various classes of radio. We hope that you will

exert your opposition against this legislation.

Again on April 9, these two fine gentlemen have gone from signing the letter in their full names to just saying Eddie and John. We have been corresponding with each other so much in opposition to this piece of legislation. They say on March 24, 1986,

We wrote you to alert you to a possible attempt by proponents of Senate bill 1433 to add their bill in the form of an amendment to legislation currently on the Senate Calendar. We now have learned that the vehicle to which they are planning to offer their amendment is S. 2180, the FEMA reauthorization bill.

That is exactly what is happening, Mr. President.

And we reiterate that the National Association of Broadcasters strongly oppose S. 1433 and urges that you oppose this attempt in securing the passage of this amendment.

And they reiterate their positions in the other two letters.

Mr. President, we are finding another factor that has been inserted into this debate as it relates to the disruption of approximately 450 small radio stations throughout this country.

Let us talk a little bit about what the distinguished Senator from Maine said in his statement in regard to probable electricity savings of 1 percent—probable savings. It is only probable, and extremely difficult to isolate from seasonal variations higher rates in fuel availability.

How can you really say that you will probably save 1 percent? I could say you probably would lose 1 percent, and would not be misrepresenting anything. Also, in some areas such as Louisville, on the westernmost fringe of the time zone, daylight comes almost an hour later than on the east coast. So consumption is actually increased for my people. As they get up an hour earlier in the dark, go to work earlier, turn their lights on sooner, turn the heat up earlier, and they are in effect subsidizing—that is that one-third we talked about. The Senator from Washington said that two-thirds of the people of this country want extended daylight savings time. But the full fact is that the other one-third will be subsidizing the savings of the people particularly on the east and west coasts.

Also, how significant is 1 percent or the probable saving of 1 percent? That translates to six-tenths of 1 percent of our daily consumption of 17 million barrels of oil a day, or the equivalent of approximately 100,000 barrels of oil per day. However, the saving is not all in oil. About 50 percent of that could be in coal.

Reduction of traffic fatalities; let us look at that just a minute—seven-tenths of 1 percent. The Department of Transportation analysis believes that further study may show that daylight saving time actually reduces the

fatalities on the order of 1½ to 2 percent. Let us go back to why.

Let us go back to why we have less fatalities. We cannot find out, and testimony in the House actually says that the Department of Transportation did not weigh other factors in this judgment such as reducing the speed to 55-miles per hour. Everyone knows that is the factor that saves lives. It is irrefutable. Yet, we find my colleagues here saying that daylight saving time takes all the credit. You just have to think that is a little irresponsible in saying that daylight saving time would reduce traffic fatalities when we all know that it was the 55-miles per hour that did it.

□ 1620

It is my understanding, Mr. President, that the distinguished Senator said that we would only have to tolerate 6 weeks of additional darkness in the western part of each time zone. Our children go to school in the dark the rest of the time, so we might as well just go ahead and go to school in the dark for 6 more weeks.

The National Bureau of Standards, which reviewed the Department of Transportation conclusions as to energy savings and as to fatalities, confirms the need for extreme caution in drawing even tentative conclusions.

Think about that. The National Bureau of Standards warns us and says to use extreme caution in drawing even tentative conclusions, and a particularly careful analysis of the data base used by the Department of Transportation in studying fatal accidents and electricity production reveals several respects in which these data are faulty.

That is the National Bureau of Standards.

The data available did not include, and so the Department of Transportation testified before the house committee, information about factors other than daylight saving time that would influence electricity usage, traffic fatalities, for example, interlocking factors, energy conservation factors, gasoline shortages, carpooling, speed limit. All these things were never factored in. The Department of Transportation agreed.

So the word "probable" is used now, probable savings.

When all these things are not factored in, you know and I know that those statistics in reality are wrong.

The National Bureau of Standards in their review subjected the data to additional analyses subsequent to those already carried out by the Department of Transportation. The methodology used in the Department of Transportation study represents standard techniques of analysis. In several instances, however, the National Bureau of Standards found the data

unsuitable for application of these methods.

So we are here today to debate. We are here to try to express our feelings, the feelings of our constituents. I hope those who support this amendment will exercise what I believe to be their better judgment. Really, when you get down to it, you are not helping the schoolchildren, you are not helping the farmers, you are not saving oil, you are not saving the use of coal, you are really not doing all of these things.

In the study as it relates to reduction of crime, the answer to that, by some, is that the criminal does not worry about the clock. He does not care what time it is. It is just whether it is dark or not. So he will go whenever it is dark.

A study on the impact of daylight saving time on crime—and that was conducted in Washington, DC, and Los Angeles, by the way—indicates a reduction involving crime for daylight saving time periods in Washington, DC, compared to the standard time period from 1973 to 1975.

My goodness, and this is 1986.

There was no impact found in L.A. because the data was too coarse. LEAA cautions against any generalization from the limited data base of the study. They did not even factor into this study the effects of high-intensity lighting or police. All these things were not factored in. How can you have real life study when you do not put in all the facts?

It is just like leaving out certain factors as relates to the saving of energy.

We see a lot of polls that are taken, and we hear a lot of percentages read. None of us have seen the basic use of that poll, whether it was a national, well-distributed poll as we would think in the political arena, how the questions were phrased, whether the poll was taken in all of the lower 48, or just taken in regional areas.

I just think, Mr. President, that this amendment is not fair. It just seems to me you could put in what factors you want and come up with the percentage you desire, and then lay that down as a study, as fact. Then you begin to question and the admissions begin to roll—"No, we did not put that in; no, we did not consider that; this was taken 11 years ago, it was taken 12 years ago." What about today?

Are we interested in saving oil today? Of course not. The price of gasoline is down so low we just want to store it because we know it is going up. But no one is really concerned about saving oil today, and this bill will not save any.

I hope that as we debate this the rest of the evening and tomorrow we will be able to reach the conclusion that, as the lady wrote to me, it seems like those of us who do not want daylight saving time can stand 6 months

of daylight saving time and those who want more daylight saving time ought to be able to stand 6 months without it.

That is fair. That is down the middle. It is equal to everybody. Whatever problems we have today will be no more next year than they are now. If we pass this amendment we will have more problems next year. Those additional problems will extend. As time changes, we will probably want to go back to just the Memorial Day to Labor Day. But that is the way it is. That is the way it is.

□ 1630

We are saying to one-third of the population of this country, "You subsidize that other two-thirds so they can play tennis here, in Washington, and barbeque on the east and west coasts."

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BUMPERS addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I want first to say to my colleague from Kentucky, Senator FORD, that, on the amendment that we had previously indicated we would offer today or tomorrow on scrambling of satellite television signals, I am pleased that there has been an agreement by the distinguished manager of this bill [Mr. GORTON], for a hearing on July 15, 16, or 17. But I want to say the reason I rise today is to serve notice that the hearings may or may not result in what I consider is the elimination of discrimination against rural America on the question of the marketing of scrambled satellite television signals.

I think that my Senate colleagues should know that Senator FORD and I were not planning to offer an amendment to confuse the matter or to deprive the networks or any of the other independent networks, such as ESPN, CBN, CNN, and so on, of their just dues. On the contrary, we have said repeatedly and I repeat now that the people from whom I am receiving letters on this issue in rural America—who have already invested anywhere from \$2,000 to \$10,000 in a satellite dish and who are now being asked to pay \$400 for a decoder because everybody is going to start scrambling—have never suggested in any of the correspondence I have received that they are looking for something for nothing. What they want is fairness. They are willing to pay a reasonable price to receive a scrambled signal. But they have had to make a substantial investment—say \$5,000—for a dish which their city cousins never had to make; they also had to pay \$400 for a decoder which their city cousins never had to pay. Further, with regard to HBO, the average charge for descrambling HBO's signal is 29 percent higher than their city cousins have to

pay, assuming their cousins pay the national retail average for HBO.

I take the position that if we do nothing, it discriminates against the 1,400,000 dish owners who live outside a cable franchise area. We have people in Arkansas who, until the satellite dishes came along, never received a signal of any kind. We have areas of my State—in the Ouachitas and the Ozarks—which are not dissimilar from the mountains of Virginia and West Virginia. If you live down in a valley, chances are you are not going to get a television signal of any kind.

Right now, there are a lot of people upset. I never heard from anybody until the word got out last Thursday and Friday that Senator FORD and I were going to offer this amendment. Suddenly, I am hearing from many network executives and cable operators. All I ever asked for in the beginning was hearings on this matter to determine whether or not the anti-trust laws were being enforced and whether or not an interindustry discussion would violate the antitrust laws. Why not let the interested industries discuss some reasonable formula for resolving this knotty problem?

The problem is not going to go away. If we are getting hearings—and I want to make this crystal clear—as simply a temporary palliative so we will not offer this amendment, I promise, we will be back.

I have perhaps a greater interest than some of my colleagues have, although any Senator from a rural State has assuredly heard from any of his constituents who have satellite antennas. I have a greater interest in this because a year ago, 2,500 people in my State were engaged in the manufacture of these dishes. We are either the largest or the second-largest State in the Nation in the manufacture of satellite dishes. There were 2,500 people in my State manufacturing satellite antennas a year ago. Today, that figure is down to 500. Sales have declined 80 percent in the past year. Why? because of two things: The exorbitant cost that people must pay to receive programs and the uncertainty as to whether or not every signal is going to be scrambled and at what cost to dish owners.

Does it make any sense to my colleagues for a worker, we will say, who lives 1 mile beyond a franchise zone of a cable company to pay more than his brother, who happens to live a mile and a half inside it? His brother gets almost everything this gentleman is getting simply because he lives just inside a cable system for \$35 a month. If the dish owner gets any of it, he has to make anywhere from a \$2,000 to \$10,000 investment, pay the \$395 for the decoder and then negotiate a deal for each channel; \$12.95 is the going rate for HBO, 29 percent higher than

the average cost if you happen to live in town.

I ask you, Mr. President, is that discriminatory or not? I believe in the free marketplace and I have been told, "Don't worry about it. The prices of these decoders are going to decline." When? How much? The decoder right now is \$395. It is generally conceded that that decoder should cost the customer between \$175 to \$195. That would be a fair price for it.

Why are we delaying an issue which is so patently discriminatory? There is a woman who lives in my State named Dianne Davis. She and her husband live in St. Joe. St. Joe is a community of probably no more than 500 or 700 people. They live just outside of town and they happen to live down in a valley—or at least, they live behind a high mountain. Until 7 years ago, they got nothing—no signal. Nobody worried about them. They chose to live in a geographic area where they could not get a signal. So they make a \$5,000 investment and they begin to get the news like everybody else in America. I am told that 75 percent of the people in this country depend almost exclusively on television for all their news. I do not think that applied to Dianne and her husband, but nevertheless, they are in the same position as 400,000 American homes who, without a satellite dish, can get no television signal.

Think about this: They are going to have to buy a decoder just to get the news. They are going to have to buy a decoder to get the networks which you can get in town without even being on cable, and only then if the networks agree to making their scrambled signal accessible.

I bought a new television set for my apartment in Little Rock the other day, and I brought it in and set it up on a table and I lifted the rabbit ears and I got five stations immediately. Dianne Davis could buy a television set and put up an antenna 200 feet high and she still could not get any kind of signal. And now the networks are talking about scrambling. CBS is getting ready to scramble before the date for these hearings. They are not planning to make their signal accessible at all.

So the networks are going to scramble. They and others are going to scramble a signal to get at the roughly 400,000 people who live inside cable areas and have dishes in order to keep them from getting an advertiser-free cable signal. In the process, they are depriving another 1½ million people who have satellite dishes from getting their signal at all. We simply must resolve this knotty problem, and I hope hearings will accomplish this.

□ 1640

Now, if you want to stand on the proposition that the free marketplace will resolve this, that is one way of resolving it. But it is going to create a tremendous financial burden on a lot of people and most of them will not be able to afford it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a list of the various programmers and their plans to scramble as best we can figure it out. This is our factsheet. This is something we have put together on our own. But it will give some idea of the urgency of the situation. For example: BET, Black Entertainment Television, plans to scramble in 1987; CBN, the fourth quarter of 1986; CNN, July 1986; Cinemax, January 1986. They are already scrambling. Disney channel, July 1986; ESPN, late 1986; Financial News Network, no firm date; CNN Headline News, July 1986; Home Box Office, January 1986. They are already scrambling. Lifetime, 1987; MTV, July 1986. Another that will be scrambled by the time we complete hearings. And the list goes on and on. Almost every one of them plan to scramble before the end of this year.

If each one that plans to scramble before the end of this year charged the consumer \$5 to unlock their particular signal, the cost will be about \$60 to \$80 a month for rural people, for something that people in town get for a maximum of \$40.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCRAMBLING PLANS

BET (Black Entertainment TV)—1987.
Bravo—No firm date.
CBN—4th Quarter, 1986.
CNN—July 1986.
Cinemax—January 1986.
Disney Channel—July 1986.
ESPN—Late 1986.
Financial News Network—no firm date.
CNN Headline News—July 1986.
Home Box Office—January 1986.
Home Theater Network—no firm date.
Lifetime—1987.
MTV: Music Videos—July 1986.
The Movie Channel—May 1986.
The Nashville Network—No firm date.
Nickelodeon—July 1986.
Playboy Channel—1987.
Showtime—May 1986.
TEMPO—September 1986.
USA Cable Network—Fourth Quarter, 1986.
VH-1 Video Hits—July 1986.
WOR (superstation)—March 1986.
WTBS—September 1986.

NETWORK FEEDS

NBC: Most broadcasting to affiliates over cable lines, except some news.
ABC: Plans to scramble in 1987.
CBS: Scrambles part time beginning May 27, 1986; no plan to allow access to dish owners.

Mr. President, there is a problem of equity here. We are not trying to hurt anybody. It is my firm conviction that this can be resolved in a way that is

fair to the rural dish owners, fair to the cable television companies across America, fair to the networks, and fair to all of those independent networks I mentioned.

The reason we want hearings is to decide what the fairest and best way to resolve the issue may be. We have no intention of trying to do economic harm to any of these people. By the same token, I admit that my interest is in protecting people who have nobody else to protect them except their elected representatives.

So, Mr. President, I rose today not to talk about daylight saving time. I intend to support the Senator from Kentucky on that issue. I just want to say this issue is not going to be over if it is not resolved in some kind of fair manner for the rural satellite dish owners of American.

U.S. FIRE ADMINISTRATION AND THE NATIONAL FIRE ACADEMY

(By request of Senator GORTON, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

● Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I want to commend the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON] for his leadership on funding for the U.S. Fire Administration and the National Fire Academy.

The budget resolution recently passed by the Senate, with my support, calls for unspecified additional savings in activities with the jurisdiction of the Federal Emergency Management Administration. The fire prevention, education and control activities to be authorized by S. 2180 fall within this jurisdiction.

However, I believe it would be a serious mistake to try to achieve these savings by terminating or drastically reducing funding for the U.S. Fire Administration and the National Fire Academy. Fire is one of the leading causes of death in this country. Too often it is reported that this needless loss of life could have been prevented through a smoke alarm, better building materials and, most important, better education and information. Spending can be reduced in other areas of the Federal Government's emergency management activities if necessary to meet the targets contained in the resolution.

S. 2180 already reflects the goal of reducing Federal spending. The bill provides an 18-percent cut from the fiscal year 1986 authorization for the U.S. Fire Administration and a 7-percent cut from the current appropriation for the National Fire Academy.

The bill will support the Academy as well as other programs by continuing the valuable courses of instruction provided to firefighters and other emergency personnel. It will also restore the travel stipends and lodging costs for the students. This is important to many local jurisdictions who

are unable to afford the costs of sending their people for this vital training.

Many of the 12,000 people per year who train at the Academy are volunteer firefighters. They attend the weekend programs and without the National Fire Academy, these dedicated people would not be able to learn from the professional staff.

The programs authorized under the Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 are too important to lose. We simply cannot afford to have the activities of the U.S. Fire Administration and the National Fire Academy eliminated or reduced. As a cosponsor of S. 2180, I look forward to working with my colleagues to find ways to make the required budget savings without impeding essential Federal efforts in the field of fire prevention and control. ●

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk, proceeded to call the roll.

□ 1720

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. McCONNELL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, not to extend beyond the hour of 6 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING THE ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 1985, the Secretary of the Senate, on May 16, 1986, received the messages from the President of the United States transmitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received on May 16, 1986 are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United

States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:41 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 120. A concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal years 1987, 1988, and 1989.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.J. Res. 636. Joint resolution designating June 26, 1986, as "National Interstate Highway Day."

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 310. A concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress with respect to agricultural loan restructuring and interest rates.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

At 1:10 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolutions:

H.R. 4382. An act to require the Architect of the Capitol to place a plaque at the original site of Providence Hospital;

H.J. Res. 234. Joint resolution designating the week of May 18, 1986, through May 24, 1986, as "National Food Bank Week";

H.J. Res. 427. Joint resolution designating the week beginning on May 11, 1986, as "National Asthma and Allergy Awareness Week";

H.J. Res. 492. Joint resolution to designate the week of June 1, 1986, as "National Neighborhood Housing Services Week";

H.J. Res. 613. Joint resolution allowing qualified persons representing all the States to be naturalized on Ellis Island on July 3 or 4, 1986;

S.J. Res. 246. Joint resolution to designate May 25, 1986, as "Hands Across America Day", for the purpose of helping people to help themselves, and commending United Support of Artists for Africa and all participants for their efforts toward combating domestic hunger with a four thousand mile human chain from coast to coast;

S.J. Res. 266. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate the month of June 1986 as "Youth Suicide Prevention Month";

S.J. Res. 271. Joint resolution designating "Baltic Freedom Day"; and

S.J. Res. 337. Joint resolution designating May 18-24, 1986 as "Just Say No to Drugs Week".

The enrolled bill and joint resolutions were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following joint resolution was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.J. Res. 636. Joint resolution designating June 26, 1986, as "National Interstate Highway Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The following concurrent resolution was read, and referred to as indicated:

H. Con. Res. 310. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress with respect to agricultural loan restructuring and interest rates, to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

MEASURE HELD AT THE DESK

The following concurrent resolution was ordered held at the desk by unanimous consent until the close of business on May 20, 1986:

S. Con. Res. 140. Concurrent resolution to pay tribute to the late William C. Lee and to designate June 6, 1986, as "William C. Lee Day".

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 19, 1986, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled joint resolutions:

S.J. Res. 246. Joint resolution to designate May 25, 1986, as "Hands Across America Day", for the purpose of helping people to help themselves, and commending United Support of Artists for Africa and all participants for their efforts toward combating domestic hunger with a four thousand mile human chain from coast to coast;

S.J. Res. 266. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate the month of June 1986 as "Youth Suicide Prevention Month";

S.J. Res. 271. Joint resolution designating "Baltic Freedom Day";

S.J. Res. 337. Joint resolution designating May 18-24, 1986 as "Just Say No to Drugs Week".

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-3161. A communication from the Administrator of the General Services Administration transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act in the Federal Telecommunications Fund; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-3162. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State transmitting, pursuant to law, a report that the President has determined it to be in the national interest to extend credit in excess of

\$50 million to the People's Republic of China for purposes of two thermal power stations; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3163. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on the Youth Conservation Corps; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3164. A communication from the Administrator of the General Services Administration transmitting, pursuant to law, a lease prospectus for acquisition of space for the IRS in Philadelphia, PA.; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3165. A communication from the Director of OIRM, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on an altered Privacy Act system of records; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3166. A communication from the chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality transmitting, pursuant to law, the council's 1985 Government in the Sunshine report; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3167. A communication from the special counsel, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on an investigation by the Secret Service into allegations of misuse of Government vehicles and misconduct by employees of the U.S. Mint in San Francisco; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3168. A communication from the Director of the Office of Personnel Management transmitting, pursuant to law, an interim report on changes in matters to be reported in the biennial report on the Senior Executive Service; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3169. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting, pursuant to law, a plan for the use of funds awarded the White Earth Band of Chippewa Indians; to the Select Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-3170. A communication from the director of the National Legislative Commission of the American Legion transmitting, pursuant to law, the Legion's financial statements for 1985; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3171. A communication from the Secretary of Education transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of final funding priorities for projects initiating special recreation programs for handicapped individuals; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-3172. A communication from the Secretary of Education transmitting, pursuant to law, final regulations under the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING THE ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of May 15, 1986, the following reports of committees were submitted on May 16, 1986, during the adjournment of the Senate:

By Mr. ROTH, from the committee of conference:

Report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2672) to redesignate the New York International and Bulk Mail Center in

Jersey City, NJ, as the "New Jersey International and Bulk Mail Center," and to honor the memory of a former postal employee by dedicating a portion of a street at the New York International and Bulk Mail Center in Jersey City, NJ, as "Michael McDermott Place" (Rept. No. 99-302).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1822. A bill to amend the Copyright Act in section 601 of title 17, United States Code, to provide for the manufacture and public distribution of certain copyrighted material (with minority views) (Rept. No. 99-303).

By Mr. ROTH, from the Committee on Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. Res. 410. An original resolution waiving section 303(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to the consideration of the conference report on H.R. 2671.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HEINZ (for himself and Mr. DANFORTH):

S. 2464. A bill to require Senate confirmation of appointments of the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the U.S. International Trade Commission; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DOLE, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. CHILES, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. ZORINSKY, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. INOUE, Mrs. HAWKINS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. WILSON, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. TRIBLE, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. KERRY, Mr. DODD, Mr. GRAMM, and Mr. D'AMATO):

S.J. Res. 349. Joint resolution to designate the week of May 25, 1986, through May 31, 1986, as "Critical Care Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUGAR (for himself, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BOSCHWITZ, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CHAFFEE, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DOLE, Mr. HATCH, Mrs. HAWKINS, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. INOUE, Mr. KERRY, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. NUNN, Mr. PELL, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. TRIBLE, Mr. WEICKER, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. ZORINSKY):

S.J. Res. 350. Joint resolution to designate 1987 as "The National Year of the Americas"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MATTINGLY:

S. Res. 409. A resolution to express the sense of the Senate that the tax reform legislation, when that bill is signed into law, remain unchanged for a minimum of 5 years for the purpose of promoting economic growth and opportunity; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROTH, from the Committee on Governmental Affairs:

S. Res. 410. An original resolution waiving section 303(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to the conference report on H.R. 2672; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. SYMMS:

S. Res. 411. A resolution expressing the support and encouragement of the Senate for those working for freedom and against communism in Southwest Africa/Namibia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DOLE, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. CHILES, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. ZORINSKY, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. INOUE, Mrs. HAWKINS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. WILSON, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. TRIBLE, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. KERRY, Mr. DODD, Mr. GRAMM, and Mr. D'AMATO):

S.J. Res. 349. Joint resolution to designate the week of May 25, 1986, through May 31, 1986, as "Critical Care Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CRITICAL CARE WEEK

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I am introducing a joint resolution which designates the last week in May as "Critical Care Week." Passage of this resolution will assist private efforts to increase public awareness, improve family support programs and advance the research of critical care medicine.

Critical care medicine is a broad term describing the medical treatment for patients in life-threatening situations requiring immediate care. Coronary, respiratory, neonatal, trauma, and intensive care units are all part of critical care medicine.

There are already more than 4,300 critical care units in the United States. Where these units are available, they often serve as many as 15 percent of hospital inpatients. Every congressional district has a constituent who has depended on critical care medicine. For instance in 1984 there were 1.1 million critical care cases in California or, in a State of 25 million, 1 out of 24 citizens needed critical care medicine.

Critical care is comprised of physicians, nurses, therapists, and industry dedicated to the delivery of care to the critically ill. These individuals must specialize in many different areas of medicine since critically ill patients may develop complications which overlap any one medical specialty.

On May 29, 1986, the Foundation for Critical Care Medicine will hold a fundraiser to increase public education efforts. I, along with Senator KENNEDY, am an honorary cochairman of this event and I would like to thank my fellow colleagues who are honorary committee members for giving their support to this effort. It is clear that critical care is a vital medical profession deserving of congressional recognition and I urge all of my colleagues to support this joint resolution.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I welcome the opportunity to join my colleagues in the Senate in cosponsoring this joint resolution which designates May 25-31 as "Critical Care Week." This week is dedicated to enhance public education efforts, to improve family support programs, and to underline the commitment of thousands of health care professionals who devote their professional lives to the care of patients who need immediate and advanced medical services.

There are millions of cases annually across the Nation where such care is essential. Auto accidents, strokes, and neonatal complications all are examples of life-threatening situations where critical care must be swift and expert. The timing of "Critical Care Week" is particularly relevant, too, because as we enter the summer season the numbers of swimming and boating accidents will rise.

While we all hope that we will never be in need of critical care, we want care to be accessible and excellent if the necessity should arise. We want that service for ourselves and for our loved ones. And we want it to be available in our neighborhoods and wherever we may travel.

Thus, it is fitting that we recognize the efforts of the many professionals across America who are devoted to critical care.

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to cosponsor legislation introduced by my colleague from Utah, Mr. HATCH, regarding critical care. I am pleased he has brought this serious issue to our attention.

Critical care is a rapidly changing and expanding area of medicine. It includes intensive care units, trauma centers, burn units, coronary care units, and neonatal and pediatric ICU's. Without a doubt, critical care addresses the most chronic and intensive illnesses in the country.

Critical care affects individuals we come into contact with daily. In 1984, 1 out of every 24 individuals needed critical care. Many of these cases were individuals involved in auto accidents, heart attacks, strokes, or industrial accidents. In 1984, 44,241 individuals died in auto accidents; 547,000 died as a result of a heart attack; and 156,000 died from a stroke.

As a member of the honorary committee of the Foundation for Critical Care Medicine, I am pleased to support the recognition of such worthy medical services. I am committed to quality care in this area and to increased public education and awareness about critical care medicine.

It is my hope that increased awareness about critical care will help this Nation better address this serious problem.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

Due to a mechanical malfunction, the additional cosponsors for May 19, 1986, will be shown in the RECORD of May 20, 1986.

SENATE RESOLUTION 409—SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING TAX REFORM LEGISLATION

Mr. MATTINGLY submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

S. RES. 409

Whereas previous, constant, and conflicting policy changes in the tax code by the Congress make it difficult for individuals to properly plan for their future;

Whereas such constant and conflicting policy changes by the Congress retard capital formation by increasing risks;

Whereas such constant and conflicting policy changes by the Congress place undue burdens on individuals and businesses by requiring the otherwise unnecessary utilization of financial resources in anticipation of such changes and modifications;

Whereas the Internal Revenue Service is drained of limited resources in trying to adapt to such changes in the tax code, and the ensuing problems are in turn transferred to taxpayers;

Whereas one of the greatest burdens placed upon small businesses is the paperwork required to comply with the tax code, and constant changes by Congress unnecessarily compound this paperwork burden;

Whereas any tax reform legislation passed by the Congress should stimulate economic growth, encourage investment, promote capital formation, expand job opportunities, and encourage savings; and

Whereas the American taxpayer deserves certainty in the tax treatment of economic decisions: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the tax reform legislation, when that bill is signed into law, remain unchanged for a minimum of five years, so as to provide stability for the American taxpayer and the private sector.

SENATE RESOLUTION 410—WAIVING CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT WITH RESPECT TO CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2672

Mr. ROTH, from the Committee on Governmental Affairs, reported the following original resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Budget:

S. RES. 410

Resolved, That, pursuant to section 303(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974,

section 303(a) of that Act be waived with respect to the consideration of the Conference Report on H.R. 2672, the Federal Employee's Retirement System Act of 1986, a bill to provide supplemental retirement benefits for employees of the federal civilian service who are covered by Social Security as mandated by the Social Security Amendments of 1983.

H.R. 2672 would violate section 303(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 because the bill provides new entitlement authority to become effective during fiscal year 1987 and would result in a change in revenues effective during fiscal year 1987, before the first concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1987 has been agreed to.

The budget authority provided in H.R. 2672 authorizes contributions from the employee and the employing agency to the pension system to fund future retirement benefits and authorizes the payment of entitlement benefits to individuals qualifying for such benefits under the provisions of H.R. 2672.

SENATE RESOLUTION 411—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THOSE WORKING FOR FREEDOM AND AGAINST COMMUNISM IN SOUTH AFRICA/NAMIBIA

Mr. SYMMS submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 411

Whereas, the President of the United States has expressed U.S. foreign policy as opposing Soviet-backed terrorist campaigns to subvert or seize control of non-Soviet countries and territories in various parts of the world, including Central America, S.E. Asia, the Middle East, Afghanistan and South West Africa;

Whereas, approximately 40,000 Cuban combat soldiers and several thousand Soviet and East German advisers presently occupy Angola and lend support to the Soviet-backed terrorist campaign of SWAPO (South West Africa People's Organization), operating from bases in southern Angola, to seize control of Namibia before that territory can achieve internationally acceptable independence;

Whereas, the United Nations General Assembly continues to designate SWAPO as the "sole and authentic" representative of the people of Namibia, accord SWAPO permanent observer status at the U.N., and finance SWAPO propaganda offices and meetings throughout the world, while refusing to recognize the various Namibian parties who make up Namibia's Multi-Party Conference;

Whereas, on June 17, 1985, the Republic of South Africa voluntarily and as a result of the peaceful negotiations with Namibia's political leaders of the Namibia Multi-Party Conference, effected a complete transfer of all administrative powers of local self-government that were previously exercised by the Administrator-General for Namibia, and official appointed by South Africa;

Whereas, Namibia's political party leaders acting on behalf of the people of Namibia immediately established Namibia's Transitional Government of National Unity and invited all political parties, including SWAPO, to participate in exercising the powers of local self-government enjoyed for

the first time since 1884 by the people of Namibia;

Whereas, Namibia's Transitional Government of National Unity opposes apartheid in all its forms and has abolished apartheid in Namibia;

Whereas, SWAPO, under Soviet direction, has refused to cooperate or participate in any democratic or peaceful process leading to Namibian independence;

Whereas, historic U.S. foreign policy has encouraged and aided indigenous political groups and similar organizations in developing countries which seek to establish non-Soviet controlled and democratic governments;

Whereas, Namibia's Transitional Government of National Unity and the various political parties comprising Namibia's Multi-Party Conference represent the most hopeful, reasonable and constructive avenue to achieve peace in South West Africa and should be supported by the United States;

Now, therefore be it, resolved: That it is the sense of the U.S. Senate that—

(1) The United States should continue to pursue serious multi-lateral initiatives aimed at achieving removal of all Cuban combat troops now occupying Angola, closure of all SWAPO bases in southern Angola and impartiality by United Nations in treatment of all Namibian political parties wishing to appear at the United Nations, and

(2) The Department of State should immediately establish contact with the leaders of all political parties who make up the Namibia Multi-Party Conference and Namibia Transitional Government of National Unity, and

(3) The United States Government should implement its support for Namibia's Transitional Government of National Unity pending a negotiated plan for internationally acceptable independence by—

(a) Establishing an interest section in Windhoek.

(b) Dispatching a delegation of officials to Windhoek for bilateral talks.

(c) Including Namibia among African nations receiving aid from the U.S. and international organizations the U.S. supports.

(d) Establishing Peace Corps representation in Namibia.

(e) Encouraging U.S. private investment in Namibia.

(f) Supporting Namibia's control of its fishing industry by requiring other nations to adhere to generally recognized international rules and existing agreements.

(g) Inviting all Namibian political parties, including Namibia's Multi-Party Conference and SWAPO, to meet in an all-parties conference to develop a consensus on the time and method for achieving independence of Namibia free from foreign control.

● Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, on December 19 last year the Secretary of State appointed a 12-member Advisory Committee on South Africa to recommend measures the United States can take to "encourage peaceful change" in South Africa and "be most effective in promoting equal rights in South Africa and ending apartheid."

The Namibian Transitional Government of National Unity and the Multi-Party Conference are exercising all powers of local self-government pending genuine independence for Namibia, which since 1920 has been ad-

ministered by South Africa pursuant to a League of Nations mandate.

The Namibia TGNU and Multi-Party Conference support the U.S. policy of peaceful change and an end to apartheid in South Africa. Indeed, on April 9 of this year the Namibian National Assembly abolished apartheid in South West Africa/Namibia.

In order to support President Reagan's policy of U.S. Government support for internal political groups opposing the Soviet expansionist campaign in southern Africa, I am introducing the following "sense of the Senate" resolution for consideration by the U.S. Senate.●

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

FEDERAL FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL ACT AUTHORIZATION

GORTON (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1967

Mr. GORTON (for himself, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. WILSON, Mr. PELL, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. BOSCHWITZ, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. MATSUNAGA) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 2180) to authorize appropriations for activities under the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:
Sec. 2. (a) The Congress finds—

(1) that various studies of governmental and nongovernmental agencies indicate that daylight saving time over an expanded period would produce a significant energy savings in electrical power consumption;

(2) that daylight saving time may yield energy savings in other areas besides electrical power consumption;

(3) that daylight saving time over an expanded period could serve as an incentive for further energy conservation by individuals, companies, and the various governmental entities at all levels of government, and that such energy conservation efforts could lead to greatly expanded energy savings; and

(4) that the use of daylight saving time over an expanded period could have other beneficial effects on the public interest, including the reduction of crime, improved traffic safety, more daylight outdoor playtime for the children and youth of our Nation, greater utilization of parks and recreation areas, expanded economic opportunity through extension of daylight hours to peak shopping hours and through extension of domestic office hours to periods of greater overlap with the European Economic Community.

(b) Section 3(a) of the Uniform Time Act of 1966 (15 U.S.C. 260a(a)) is amended by striking "last Sunday of April" and inserting in lieu thereof "first Sunday of April".

(c) Any law in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) adopted pursuant to section 3(a)(2) of the Uniform Time Act of 1966 by a State with parts thereof in more than one time zone, or

(2) adopted pursuant to section 3(a)(1) of such Act by a State that lies entirely within one time zone,

shall be held and considered to remain in effect as the exercise by that State of the exemption permitted by such Act unless the State, by law, provides that such exemption shall not apply.

(d)(1) Notwithstanding any other law or any regulation issued under any such law, the Federal Communications Commission shall, consistent with any existing treaty or other agreement, make such adjustment by general rules, or by interim action pending such general rules, with respect to hours of operation of daytime standard amplitude modulation broadcast stations, as may be consistent with the public interest, including the public's interest in receiving interference-free service.

(2) Such general rules, or interim action, may include variances with respect to operating power and other technical operating characteristics.

(3) Subsequent to the adoption of such general rules, they may be, varied with respect to particular stations and areas because of the exigencies in each case.

(e) This section shall take effect 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, except that if such effective date occurs in any calendar year after March 1, this section shall take effect on the first day of the following calendar year.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry has scheduled a committee business session to consider reporting the nominations of Hon. Frank W. Naylor, Jr. and Dr. Marvin R. Duncan to be members of the Farm Credit Administration Board, Farm Credit Administration.

The meeting will begin at 10 a.m., on Tuesday, May 20, 1986, in room 332, Russell Senate Office Building.

For further information, please contact Warren Oxford or Terry Wear of the committee staff at 224-2035.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the committee's notice which appeared in the May 16, 1986, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, contained a misprint. The Senate Small Business Committee's oversight hearing on the implementation of the Prompt Payment Act, Public Law 97-177, will take place on Thursday, June 19, 1986, and not in July, as was erroneously printed by the RECORD. The hearing will commence at 10 a.m. and will be held in room 428A of the Russell Senate Office Building. For further information, please contact William B. Montalto, procurement policy counsel for the committee, at 224-5175.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public

that the Subcommittee on Energy Research and Development of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources will conduct the following oversight hearings:

Monday, June 16, beginning at 1 p.m. in room SD-366 of the Senate Dirksen Office Building in Washington, DC, on the second waste repository site selection under the Department of Energy's Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management.

Monday, June 23, beginning at 2 p.m. in room SD-366 of the Senate Dirksen Office Building in Washington, DC, on the Department of Energy's budget authority—Office of Energy Research and Office of Environment, Health and Safety.

Those wishing to testify or who wish to submit written statements for the hearing record, should write to the Subcommittee on Energy Research and Development, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510.

For further information regarding this hearing, please contact Ms. Marilyn Meigs or Mr. K.P. Lau on the subcommittee staff at 202-224-4431.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Consumer Subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Monday, May 19, to conduct a hearing on the pending product liability legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

U.N. VOTING PATTERNS SEND DISTURBING SIGNALS

● Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, this is the Year of Liberty, the year during which we will rededicate the statue in New York harbor that for the past century has welcomed to our shores and to a new life the oppressed, impoverished citizens of the world.

And in rededicating ourselves to the principles of liberty that make this Nation great, we also are renewing our commitment as a nation blessed by prosperity to help those countries less fortunate than ourselves.

American largesse is historic. It also is taken for granted. And while we should never as a nation turn our backs on those in need, we must seriously consider our priorities in giving aid to the world.

Consider this disturbing fact: The 159 member states of the United Na-

tions voted against American interests in the General Assembly last year on average 80 percent of the time.

Mr. President, that is the conclusion of the third annual "Kasten Report," the study of U.N. voting patterns done by the U.S. State Department in accordance with legislation I sponsored requiring these annual reports.

The report shows that once again Israel is our staunchest ally, siding with us on 91.5 percent of the votes before the General Assembly. A number of our NATO allies—the United Kingdom (86.6 percent), West Germany (84.4 percent), France (82.7 percent, up from 72 percent in 1984), Belgium (82.3 percent), and Italy (81.8 percent) all increased their support for the United States.

But, unfortunately, they were the exceptions to what is becoming a disturbing rule.

Mr. President, most of the time, on most of the critical issues facing our Nation, we stand almost alone in the United Nation.

According to the State Department analysis, the key issues before the General Assembly included positions taken by the United Nations on terrorism, the Soviet invasion and continued occupation of Afghanistan, Vietnam's occupation of Cambodia, the Arab-Israeli conflict, apartheid, human rights abuses in several countries, and efforts to delete instances of name calling against various United States foreign policy positions.

It is a sad reality, Mr. President, that we cannot even count on other NATO allies to support our positions with any consistency. Turkey and Greece, particularly, two countries which receive hundreds of millions of dollars in United States aid each year, voted consistently against us—Turkey 60 percent of the time and Greece 66 percent of the time.

Turkey refused to criticize human rights abuses in Iran and supported name-calling attacks against United States policy in the Middle East—both considered key votes by the State Department.

It should not be surprising that the strongest opposition to our positions, in addition to Communist block nations in Eastern Europe, comes from the 21-member Arab group. It supported America on only 12.2 percent of the votes.

African nations, many of which look to America for the very survival of their people, gave us their support on only 15.1 percent of the votes.

There is a bright spot in the most recent "Kasten Report." Since our liberation of that Grenada, that country has become an increasingly dependable friend of America at the United Nations. In 1983, Grenada opposed our position in the General Assembly more than 80 percent of the time. But in 1984, it supported us in 60 percent

of the votes, and it has since raised its level of support to over 70 percent.

Mr. President, we are not attempting to buy votes with the aid we send to the needy nations of the world. But we do have the right to expect that if these nations aggressively seek our assistance, our money, and our protection, they in turn will support the positions that continue to keep our Nation strong enough and vital enough to continue sending such assistance.

And yet, many of these nations are nowhere in sight when we need their support in the United Nations.

According to this most recent U.N. vote analysis, Egypt, a major recipient of United States foreign aid, opposed our positions a shocking 85 percent of the time. Even the Philippines supported us on only 22 percent of the General Assembly votes.

I urge all of my colleagues to carefully consider the pattern of voting by those nations who seek, and receive, our aid. In these times of cutting back we must place priorities not only on how our dollars are spent, but where.

The American people expect no less of their elected representatives.

Mr. President, I ask that the General Assembly voting record be placed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

Africa:	
Ivory Coast.....	27.3
Malawi.....	26.9
Liberia.....	23.7
Zaire.....	23.1
Mauritius.....	22.1
Swaziland.....	22.0
Equatorial Guinea.....	21.2
Central African Rep.....	20.9
Gabon.....	19.7
Senegal.....	19.3
Togo.....	19.0
Sierra Leone.....	18.3
Cameroon.....	18.0
Chad.....	18.0
Niger.....	17.6
Botswana.....	17.4
Rwanda.....	17.4
Kenya.....	16.7
Somalia.....	16.3
Mauritania.....	16.1
Lesotho.....	16.0
Burundi.....	15.9
Morocco.....	15.9
Sudan.....	15.5
Egypt.....	15.3
Gambia.....	14.9
Zambia.....	14.9
Nigeria.....	14.7
Zimbabwe.....	14.6
Djibouti.....	14.3
Tunisia.....	13.9
Ghana.....	13.2
Uganda.....	13.2
Burkina Faso.....	13.1
Guinea Bissau.....	12.2
Comoros.....	12.1
Guinea.....	12.1
Cape Verde.....	11.9
Seychelles, The.....	11.9
Congo.....	11.3
Tanzania.....	11.3
Mali.....	11.1
Madagascar.....	10.6
Sao Tome and Principe.....	10.3

Ethiopia.....	9.3
Benin.....	8.8
Libya.....	6.9
Mozambique.....	5.9
Algeria.....	5.1
Angola.....	3.5

Group average..... 15.1

U.N. VOTING RECORD 40TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY¹

ALL UNGA PLENARY VOTES²

[Percent Coincidence with U.S. Votes (Yes/No)]

Asia and the Pacific:	
Japan.....	66.3
Australia.....	60.2
New Zealand.....	55.3
Solomons.....	48.1
Samoa.....	27.4
Fiji.....	26.0
Singapore.....	23.6
Papua New Guinea.....	23.1
Thailand.....	22.4
Philippines.....	22.3
Kampuchea.....	21.4
Nepal.....	18.0
Burma.....	17.1
Sri Lanka.....	16.8
Malaysia.....	16.3
Bangladesh.....	16.1
Pakistan.....	16.1
China.....	15.9
Brunei.....	15.3
Indonesia.....	14.3
Jordan.....	14.2
Bhutan.....	13.9
Oman.....	13.6
Saudi Arabia.....	13.6
Vanuatu.....	13.4
Lebanon.....	13.1
Bahrain.....	12.8
Qatar.....	12.8
Emirates.....	12.8
Maldives.....	12.5
Kuwait.....	12.2
Cyprus.....	11.6
Iran.....	11.3
Mongolia.....	9.9
Yemen (A.R.).....	9.0
India.....	8.9
Iraq.....	8.7
Syria.....	8.1
Viet Nam.....	6.5
Afghanistan.....	6.2
Laos.....	5.9
Yemen (P.D.R.).....	5.7

Group average..... 17.0

The Americas:	
Grenada.....	71.7
Canada.....	69.8
St. Christopher and Nevis.....	50.0
Belize.....	37.8
Paraguay.....	35.4
St. Vincent and Grenadines.....	32.7
Chile.....	31.4
El Salvador.....	30.2
Honduras.....	29.8
Costa Rica.....	29.1
Colombia.....	27.9
St. Lucia.....	26.2
Guatemala.....	25.2
Antigua and Barbuda.....	25.0
Dominican Republic.....	25.0
Ecuador.....	24.6
Dominica.....	24.2
Haiti.....	23.8
Jamaica.....	22.7
Barbados.....	20.3
Panama.....	19.7
Venezuela.....	19.0
Bahamas.....	18.6

Bolivia	18.5
Uruguay	18.1
Trinidad and Tobago	17.9
Peru	17.8
Argentina	16.4
Suriname	16.2
Brazil	16.0
Mexico	14.5
Guyana	13.9
Nicaragua	8.4
Cuba	6.2
Group average	23.7
Western Europe:	
United Kingdom	86.6
Federal Rep. Germany	84.4
France	82.7
Belgium	82.3
Italy	81.9
Luxembourg	80.2
Netherlands	76.3
Portugal	75.0
Iceland	62.4
Norway	61.2
Denmark	58.3
Spain	55.6
Ireland	51.0
Sweden	42.2
Austria	40.0
Finland	39.8
Turkey	38.1
Greece	33.3
Malta	16.5
Group average	59.2
No Affiliation:	
Israel	91.5
Eastern Europe	
Poland	14.8
Romania	14.6
Hungary	12.3
Ukraine	12.3
Bulgaria	12.2
Byelorussia S.S.R.	12.2
Czechoslovakia	12.2
German Democratic Rep.	12.2
USSR	12.2
Yugoslavia	11.9
Albania	6.7
Group average	12.4

¹ Table contains all countries which participated in the 40th UNGA, September-December 1985.

² Table reflects all votes recorded in UNGA plenary, including votes on separate paragraphs.●

FAMILY CAREGIVERS RESOLUTION

● Mr. HEINZ. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to join the distinguished ranking minority member of the Senate Aging Committee and a number of our colleagues in introducing a resolution designating the week of November 24, 1986, as the first "National Family Caregivers Week."

Recognizing family caregivers is important because the bulk of personal care for the frail elderly falls largely on the family, not on the Federal Government or outside social service agencies. For every person 65 years of age and older residing in a nursing home, there are nearly twice as many persons residing in the community requiring similar levels of care. Eighty percent of the disabled elderly receive care from family members, most frequently from wives, daughters, and

daughters-in-law. For many, this is a round-the-clock responsibility that leaves the caregiver emotionally and physically exhausted.

The reliance on families for care, and the stress associated with caregiving is certain in the future because of three major trends. First, the elderly population has grown much more rapidly in the 20th century than has the rest of the population and this trend will continue into the 21st century. For families, this trend is especially important since the population group of seniors age 85 and older is the fastest growing age group in our society. Typically, seniors in this age group need far more assistance due to chronic disabling conditions than seniors of other ages, and most of this assistance is provided by their families.

Second, as the population continues to age, we will find more elderly being cared for by adult children who themselves are older and who suffer chronic impairments. Additionally, many adult children who care for elderly parents also care for children of their own. The stress placed on these individuals is especially severe.

Third, women, who traditionally have provided the bulk of assistance to the disabled elderly, are now forced to choose between caregiving and participating in the paid labor force. Labor force participation rates for women have increased to about 55 percent in 1984. Almost 64 percent of women aged 45 to 54 years old—those who are most likely to have parents in the oldest age group—were in the labor force in 1984.

"National Family Caregivers Week" would recognize the vital role of these caregivers. Family caregivers make enormous personal and financial sacrifices to care for their loved ones. Their contributions help maintain strong family ties and strengthen intergenerational support. The cash value of caregiving services provided by families far exceeds the combined cost of Government and professional services to the elderly living in the community and in institutions.

Acknowledgment of the valuable contributions of the family caregiver would provide for greater public awareness of and community support for these Americans. It is my sincere hope that public recognition of the often heroic efforts of family caregivers would help to increase the availability of respite care and other supportive services. Family caregivers are a silent majority that deserves our support and our deep appreciation.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this resolution and I commend my distinguished colleague, Senator GLENN, for his leadership in this area.●

FRED L. ESKEW

● Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, Maryland lost one of its most out-

standing citizens and public servants recently with the death of Fred L. Eskew, assistant secretary of the Maryland Department of Natural Resources.

It was Fred Eskew, more than any single person in the State of Maryland, who was responsible for the development of Maryland's very successful Open Space Program. Almost every community in Maryland benefited in one way or another from his foresight and his effective management of this Federal and State program.

A native of Washington, DC, he graduated from St. John's College High School in Washington, DC, in 1957. He attended Randolph Macon College, Ashland, VA, and graduated from the University of Maryland in 1964 with a bachelor of science degree in recreation and parks administration. He was further recognized that same year as the outstanding graduating senior in the parks and recreation department at Maryland. He also took advanced studies in urban and regional planning from the University of Northern Colorado at Greeley. On two other occasions, the University of Maryland College of Physical Education, Recreation, and Health honored Mr. Eskew with their outstanding achiever award for his work with public parks and recreation.

During his career, he served on the professional staffs of the Prince George's County Recreation Department, the Charles County Department of Parks and Recreation, the Maryland Department of Forests and Parks, and the Maryland Department of Natural Resources. He also worked extensively with the Maryland General Assembly to develop and enhance numerous State laws affecting public parks, recreation, and natural resource management. He was a noted authority on State law relating to public parks, recreation, open space, and natural resources.

One of his major successes was Maryland's "Open Space Program." As its first director in December 1971, he initiated timely and unique policies making this program one of the most successful and innovative State grants-in-aid programs in the United States. Program Open Space has assisted the purchase and development of more than 2,200 local parks and recreation areas in every Maryland county and town. It has also provided more than 90,000 acres of State natural resource lands and parks to the State of Maryland.

Following his appointment as chairman of the Governor's commission to study concessions in Maryland State parks in August 1976, he was instrumental in establishing private enterprise concessions on certain State lands, including Rosaryville State Park in Prince George's County, Fair

Hill Natural Resources Management area in Cecil County, and Somers Cove Marina in Somerset County.

He also worked to reduce construction costs on certain new State park and other public facilities by organizing construction crews for small park projects. Another project, in cooperation with District II of the Federated Garden Clubs of Maryland, was a joint effort to plan and develop the Helen Avalynne Tawes Garden in Annapolis. It is located at the department of natural resources headquarters.

Mr. Eskew had a particular concern for natural area preservation as well as outdoor recreation. He had considerable involvement in efforts to reserve the "Belt Woods" near Largo in Prince George's County which has been recognized as one of the oldest stands of oak and poplar in the State and is now designated a National Natural Landmark.

Mr. Eskew served as president of the Maryland Recreation and Parks Association which awarded him its "Honor Member" citation. He worked closely with a number of conservation organizations such as the Nature Conservancy who awarded him its Certificate of Special Recognition. In 1983, he was appointed by Gov. Harry Hughes as the State liaison officer representing Maryland efforts to utilize Federal Land and Water Conservation Funds for supplementing State and local outdoor recreation projects. Recently, he submitted a paper to the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors recommending a funding procedure for public parks and recreation for the next 30 years. He worked with a variety of special groups from all over Maryland, including watermen from Somerset County, Washington County Boy Scouts, the Cecil County Fair Association, and varied interests at Fair Hill in Cecil County.

Dr. Torrey C. Brown, secretary of the department of natural resources, remarked,

Fred Eskew was a respected public park and recreational professional leader and is remembered for his calm and determined efforts. His efforts have contributed toward a marked improvement in the quality of life throughout the State of Maryland for all its citizens, both now and in the future.

Fred Eskew's passing is a great loss to the people of Maryland.●

ANNUAL FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE OF SENATOR STAFFORD

● Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. President, in each of the last 12 years, I have made public disclosures of my financial holdings, along with summaries of my Federal tax return.

I have pledged that I would issue a similar report to the citizens of Vermont each year for the remainder of my time in public office.

In keeping with that promise, I am once again issuing a public statement of financial disclosure.

The financial statement shows that my wife, Helen, and I had net assets of \$805,000 as of May 15, when the evaluation was made.

The statement I am making public details our holdings, including bank accounts, cash value of life insurance and Federal retirement fund, real and personal property we own, and stocks and bonds.

The majority of the stocks and bonds listed were owned by us before I entered public office in Vermont 31 years ago.

The summary of our joint Federal income tax return shows that Mrs. Stafford and I had an adjusted gross income of \$126,000 last year. Of that total, \$75,100 came from my salary as a U.S. Senator.

Our total tax bill for the year was more than \$46,000, of which more than \$37,000 was in Federal income taxes and more than \$8,800 in Vermont State income taxes.

I shall ask that details of our financial statement be printed in the RECORD, as in the past. And, as I have done in each of the last 12 years, I am making copies of the statement available to newspapers, radio and television stations, and other news services in Vermont.

This information is being made public because I remain convinced that those who serve in Government, as well as Government itself, must be as open and candid as possible with the public.

The net assets of the Staffords increased by \$45,000 last year, thanks to the bullish state of the American economy. A major portion of our assets continues to consist of homes in Virginia and Vermont whose estimated fair market value is \$320,000.

One of the best ways Americans have to judge whether their Government and their officials are acting properly is to provide full disclosure of all interests of Government and of those who make decisions in Government.

Thus, I invite all Vermonters—and all other Americans—to examine my financial interests and to match those interests with my record as a public official.

We have made some progress in providing the public with more information about the interests and activities of public officials, but we have a long way to go in providing full public disclosure.

I shall continue to support legislation that provides greater ventilation of the way we do business in Government. In the meantime, I shall continue to make my own full disclosure to my fellow Vermonters.

The material follows:

Summary of 1985 joint Federal income tax return of Robert T. and Helen K. Stafford

Income:	
Salary.....	\$75,100.00
Interest.....	10,879.04
Dividends.....	3,471.63
Honoraria.....	22,500.00
Other.....	17,831.88

Total income.....	129,782.55
-------------------	------------

Adjustments to income: Allowable congressional expenses not reimbursed.....	3,004.98
---	----------

Total adjustments to income.....	3,004.98
Adjusted gross income.....	126,777.57
Deductions.....	10,267.61
Exemptions.....	4,160.00
Taxable income.....	112,349.96
Federal income tax due and paid.....	37,356.28

Certificates of deposit:	
Chittenden Trust Co.....	10,000.00
First Vermont Bank.....	10,000.00
Howard Bank.....	10,000.00
Howard Bank.....	10,000.00
Marble Savings Bank.....	10,000.00
Proctor Bank.....	10,000.00
Proctor Bank.....	10,000.00
Vermont National Bank.....	10,000.00
Vermont National Bank.....	10,000.00
Vermont Federal Bank.....	10,000.00

Total.....	100,000.00
------------	------------

Checking accounts:	
First Virginia Bank.....	600.00
Howard Bank.....	200.00
Riggs National Bank.....	30,000.00

Total.....	30,800.00
------------	-----------

Life insurance:	
Connecticut General.....
MONEY.....
NYLIC.....
NSLI.....
Travelers.....

Total.....	20,000.00
------------	-----------

Real estate (estimated market value):	
3541 Devon Dr., Falls Church, VA.....	160,000.00
27 Howard Avenue, Rutland, VT.....	60,000.00
64 Litchfield Avenue, Rutland, VT.....	100,000.00

Total.....	320,000.00
------------	------------

Additional assets:	
Contributions to Federal retirement (Dec. 31, 1985).....	88,063.87
Law library and office furniture.....	2,000.00
Boat and two cars.....	80,000.00
Personal property.....	35,000.00

Total.....	205,063.87
------------	------------

Stock name	Shares	Value
AT&T.....	100 at 24 1/4	\$2,413.00
Cons Edison of New York (common).....	200 at 42 1/2	8,526.00
Gillette Co.....	20 at 88 1/4	1,765.00
Greyhound Corp.....	20 at 35 1/4	705.00
Howard Bank.....	1,425 at 39	55,575.00
Monsanto.....	80 at 61 1/4	4,911.00
NL Industries.....	40 at 13 1/2	540.00
National Distillers.....	40 at 40 1/4	1,630.00
Navistar International (formerly International Harvester).....	20 at 10 1/2	202.60
NYNEX.....	159 at 60 1/4	9,619.00

Stock name	Shares	Value
Outboard Marine	40 at 35%	1,415.00
Security Pacific Corp.	19 at 35%	677.00
Time, Inc.	268 at 77 1/4	20,703.00
Vendo	10 at 6%	69.10
Verbanco (formerly Bellows Falls)	240 at 47 1/4	11,400.00
West Point (formerly Cluett Peabody)	18 at 17 1/4	310.50
Total		120,461.00
Keough account Howard Bank		9,186.77
Recapitulation: Total assets		805,511.84 ●

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

● Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD the budget scorekeeping report for this week," prepared by the Congressional Budget Office in response to section 5 of the first budget resolution for fiscal year 1986." This report also serves as the scorekeeping report for the purposes of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, "as amended."

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, May 19, 1986.

HON. PETE V. DOMENICI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The attached report shows the effects of congressional action on the budget for fiscal year 1986. The estimated totals of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are compared to the appropriate or recommended levels contained in the most recent budget resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 32. This report meets the requirements for Senate scorekeeping of section 5 of Senate Concurrent Resolution 32 and is current through May 16, 1986. The report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act as amended.

No changes have occurred since my last report.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,

EDWARD GRAMLICH,
(For Rudolph G. Penner).

CBO WEEKLY SCOREKEEPING REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, 99TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, AS OF MAY 16, 1986

(Fiscal year 1986—in billions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues	Debt subject to limit
Current level ¹	1,057.1	980.3	778.6	2,016.6
Budget resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 32	1,069.7	967.6	795.7	2,078.7
Current level is:				
Over resolution by		12.7		
Under resolution by	12.6		17.1	62.1

¹ The current level represents the estimated revenue and direct spending effects (budget authority and outlays) of all legislation that Congress has enacted in this or previous sessions or sent to the President for his approval. In addition, estimates are included of the direct spending effects for all entitlement or other programs requiring annual appropriations under current law even though the appropriations have not been made. The current level excludes the revenue and direct spending effects of legislation that is in earlier stages of completion, such as reported from a Senate committee or passed by the Senate. The current level of debt subject to limit reflects the latest U.S. Treasury information on public debt transactions.

² The current statutory debt limit is \$2,078.7 billion.

FISCAL YEAR 1986 SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR CBO WEEKLY SCOREKEEPING REPORT, U.S. SENATE, 99TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, AS OF MAY 16, 1986

(In millions of dollars)

Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
I. Enacted in previous sessions:		
Revenues		777,794
Permanent appropriations and trust funds	723,461	629,772
Other appropriations	525,778	544,947
Offsetting receipts	-188,561	-188,561
Total enacted in previous sessions	1,060,679	986,159
II. Enacted this session:		
Commodity Credit Corporation urgent supplemental appropriation, 1986 (Public Law 99-243)		4
Federal Employees Benefits Improvements Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-251)		-51
VA home loan guarantee amendments (Public Law 99-255)	-4,259	-6,001
Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-272)		765
Department of Agriculture urgent supplemental, 1986 (Public Law 99-263)		
Advance to Hazardous Substances Response Trust Fund (Public Law 99-270)		
FHA and GNMA Credit Commitment Assistance Act (Public Law 99-289)		-380
Total	-4,259	-6,428
III. Continuing resolution authority		
IV. Conference agreements ratified by both Houses		
V. Entitlement authority and other mandatory items requiring further appropriation action:		
Veterans compensation	272	185
Veterans readjustment benefits	91	91
Compact of free association	205	205
Special benefits (Federal employees)	14	14
Family social services	100	75
Guaranteed student loans	6	
Payment to civil service retirement ¹	(37)	(37)
Total entitlements	688	570
Total current level as of May 16, 1986	1,057,108	980,302
1986 budget resolution (S. Con. Res. 32)	1,069,700	967,600
Amount remaining:		
Over budget resolution		12,702
Under budget resolution	12,592	17,141

¹ Interfund transactions do not add to budget totals.

Note: Numbers may not add due to rounding. ●

HONORING NAVAL AIR STATION BARBERS POINT

● Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, 1986 marks the diamond anniversary for naval aviation. It was 75 years ago that Capt. Washington Irving Chambers, a naval officer in charge of naval aviation, prepared the requisition for the Navy's first aircraft.

During this celebration, I wish to recognize Naval Air Station Barbers Point, HI. Initially, a major aircraft training and servicing center during World War II, Naval Air Station Barbers Point evolved into a major anti-submarine support community. As the defense needs of the United States have changed, so has the type of aircraft based at the air station.

Under construction prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor, NAS Barbers Point was hurriedly commissioned on April 15, 1942, and was immediately used to train pilots and to service planes of aircraft carriers in the Pacific theater.

When the war ended, the original 256-man complement of the station had grown to over 4,000 servicemen. The air station then served as a rapid demobilization center. As military forces were reduced to peacetime needs, Barbers Point assumed support functions of all aviation activities in the area.

In the next two decades, during the Korean and Vietnam wars, Barbers Point again served as a staging area for supplies and personnel in defense of freedom. Fleet tactical support squadron 21, or V-21, grew into one of the Navy's largest squadrons during the Vietnam war, ferrying thousands of tons of supplies and personnel into the Southeast Asian theater of operations.

From the mid-1950's to 1965, the air station was also home to airborne early warning squadron 2, which flew super constellations equipped with radar domes. The constellation flew 24 hours a day, 365 days a year to extend the continental air defense early warning line across the Pacific, between Hawaii and the Aleutian Islands.

Today, patrol wing 2, the major tenant command on NAS Barbers Point, conducts undersea surveillance operations. Our P-3 Orions of NAS Barbers Point provide airborne platforms for the world's most sophisticated submarine detection and tracking equipment.

These P-3's often served as "angels of mercy" in the 1970's and 1980's, locating and recruiting hundreds of "boat people" in the South China Sea who fled Vietnam.

NAS Barbers Point is also home to the Navy's oldest active squadron, Fleet Composite Squadron One, or VC-1, Helicopter Squadron Light Thirty-Seven Reconnaissance Squadron Three, or VQ-3, Coast Guard Air Sta-

tion, U.S. Army 147th Aviation Co., and the Hawaii Air National Guard.

Each year commands in the Pacific and Atlantic Fleets compete for the Chief of Naval Operation's Golden Anchor Award recognizing the best command in the East and the best in the West for a superior retention program. Last year, Naval Air Station Barbers Point received the Golden Anchor Award.

During the 75th anniversary of naval aviation, I commend the men and women for their outstanding professionalism and superb performance in maintaining and supporting the Pacific Fleet.●

UNITED STATES CAN'T BOW TO MERCHANT MARINE BLITZ

● Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, a very thoughtful and sobering article by Robert J. Hanks, entitled "U.S. Can't Bow to Merchant Marine Blitz," appeared in the May 13 edition of the Wall Street Journal. The main points of the article are: The Soviets are waging an economic war at sea through cutthroat commercial competition as part of the admitted Soviet view that "peacetime employment of merchant fleets is an integral part of the political and economic struggle between antagonistic social systems"; the liner segment of the U.S. merchant fleet has suffered as a consequence, with attendant adverse national security ramifications; and that the Federal Government must act to revitalize our merchant marine.

Mr. President, the Federal commitment Mr. Hanks urges is right on the mark. In 1978, during my tenure as chairman of the Merchant Marine Subcommittee, Congress enacted the Controlled Carrier Act in an effort to stop the pernicious rate-cutting practices of state-controlled carriers, principally those of the Soviet Union. Even though Congress was successful in enacting that legislation, the measure was opposed by the State and Justice Departments.

Mr. Hanks has several suggestions about further measures we might take to revitalize our merchant fleet, and I commend his article to every Member of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 13, 1986]

U.S. CAN'T BOW TO MERCHANT-MARINE BLITZ (By Robert J. Hanks)

A war at sea is being waged against Western nations by the Soviet Union. The principal participants are not men-o-war but mundane merchant ships and the rates being charged for commercial cargoes.

Unfortunately, this struggle has attracted scant attention in the U.S. While there have been Western casualties—shipping companies forced out of business and shipbuilding and repair yards closed—precious little is being done about them. The tragedy is the

U.S., today, is as dependent on the sea as was England at the outset of World War II, for economic and military reasons. Yet the matter's generally greeted in Washington with a yawn.

The facts are these. From a tiny fleet in 1945—mostly U.S. lend-lease Liberty ships—the Soviet merchant marine had grown by 1984 to an astounding 2,475 ships (1,000 gross tons or over) totaling more than 23 million deadweight tons. In the world, it ranked second to Panama in numbers of ships and seventh in tonnage. By contrast, the U.S. could boast fewer than 500 merchantmen. Moreover, cut-throat competition from Soviet ships has produced significant reductions in the fleets of America's European and Japanese allies.

Troublesome portents are embedded in these statistics. NATO, being a maritime alliance, would critically depend on seaborne transport of reinforcements and logistic supplies from North America in the event of a war in Europe. A continuous flow of food and raw materials from overseas would also be required to sustain any war effort. At the same time, scores of merchant ships would be needed as auxiliaries to support NATO navies. The Falkland Islands war underlined the latter requirement. Allied capability to meet these commitments, however, steadily shrinks.

Why are the Soviets waging this non-shooting war? The answer is in a book, "The Sea Power of the State," by former head of the Soviet navy, Admiral S.G. Gorshkov. He says the peacetime employment of merchant fleets is an integral part of the political and economic struggle between "antagonistic social systems."

The Soviet strategy in this war is simple: rate-cutting. The Soviet merchant fleet is a wholly subsidized creature of Moscow and can set cargo haulage rates well below market profitability floors. Offering carriage fees ranging from 10 percent to 40 percent below those floors, Soviet ships have made massive inroads in trade, not only to Third World countries, but along crucial Atlantic and Pacific Ocean routes as well. Obviously, Free World shipping companies cannot offer such rates and remain in business. Further, along those trade routes where the Soviet merchant fleet is not present in strength, ships from the U.S.S.R.'s East European satellites—also operating with government assistance—pursue identical policies.

How successful have the Soviets been? In a word: very. Two major U.S. shipping carriers—Pacific Far East Line Inc., and States Steamship Lines—have been bankrupted because U.S. free-market policies ask American shippers to compete against the Soviet government. In the Pacific, for example, the Soviet Far East Shipping Company and its Polish counterpart slashed rates to capture trade. When other low cost operators such as the Taiwanese followed suit, the American carriers simply could no longer compete for cargoes. Similar effects have been felt in strong maritime nations such as Britain, Sweden, West Germany and Japan.

What, then, should be done about this economic war at sea? Some West European countries have taken steps to halt the decline of their merchant fleets. But Washington remains indifferent.

Several things can be done. First, more than lip service needs to be accorded the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, which emphasized the importance of a healthy merchant fleet to the security of this country. Next, Washington can insure that all gov-

ernment cargoes are carried in U.S. ships. (This includes food aid being sent to needy nations.) Negotiation of bilateral accords must be relentlessly pressed to reserve reasonable cargo percentages for American shipping companies. The U.S. would, in a pinch, need guaranteed access to container ships to carry military equipment.

The West can ignore the Soviet war on commercial shipping only at its peril.●

BOB WIELAND AND THE SPIRIT OF AMERICA

● Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, in just a few days, hundreds of thousands of Americans will participate in an unusual once-in-a-lifetime event. On May 25, men, women and children of all ages; families, friends, and strangers all holding hands at precisely the same moment, will form a gigantic human chain stretching from the Eastern shore of America with the Western coast.

The project scheduled for May 25 is called "Hands Across America." the proceeds will go to fight hunger.

I would like to believe that the participants in that undertaking will give a few moments of thought to the almost unbelievable accomplishment of a young man from Wisconsin—a man who walked across America on his hands to raise money for hunger relief groups.

On Wednesday, May 14, after 3 years, 8 months and 6 days, after 2,784.1 miles stretching from the California coast to the White House, after 4,903,360 steps—steps made without feet and without legs, but with a strong heart, Bob Wieland finished his "Spirit of America Walk for Hunger."

Mr. Wieland's walk raised \$300,000. Future pledges could raise millions more.

What kind of spirit is it that challenges such men to commit so much of themselves to as selfless a goal as feeding the hungry?

What kind of spirit is it that would lead a man to give almost 4 years of his life to call attention to something most Americans never think of—the fact that every day 35,000 of our fellow human beings worldwide die of hunger?

And, Mr. President, what kind of spirit infuses such life into a man whose body was torn apart in service to this country?

The answer to all three questions is the same. It is the spirit of America.

Mr. Wieland's journey across America started at Knott's Berry Farm in Los Angeles. But his struggle to overcome his physical disability started in the jungles of Southeast Asia on June 14, 1969. His squad was on a search-and-destroy mission in an area believed to be booby-trapped with landmines. He saw a buddy go down under enemy fire.

With no thought of his own safety, rather than search for protection, Mr. Wieland, a medic, rushed to the aid of his friend, fellow Wisconsinite Jerome D. Lubeno. In his struggle to reach the mortally wounded soldier, Mr. Wieland stepped on a mine which, in his own words, "blew my body one way and my legs the other."

Some say it was his superb physical training, his love of sports and his fanaticism in maintaining excellent health that gave him the strength to overcome what for so many would have been a completely disabling injury. He said he would not be hampered by his accident. He kept that pledge, and in keeping it, proved something else.

In his "Walk For Hunger," Mr. Wieland proved not only his superb body conditioning and strength, but he also proved the strength of his spirit.

The spirit Mr. Wieland has shown is but a flicker of the combined strength of character found in the tens of thousands of Americans disabled during the Vietnam war.

Mr. Wieland's heroic accomplishment is the definition of the selflessness of the American spirit. That he chose to dedicate this accomplishment to drawing the attention of his fellow countrymen to world hunger is a tribute to his personal selflessness.

Mr. President, I commend Mr. Wieland for his triumph, a triumph of body and a triumph of spirit. May his story serve to remind us all that life is precious, life is important, and life is meant to be shared.

Mr. Wieland has shared a great part of himself with all of us through his "Walk For Hunger."

Mr. President, I ask that the following articles from the Milwaukee Journal and Sentinel be inserted in the RECORD.

The articles follow:

2,784-MILE TREK

(By Richard Bradec)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Doc finally made it Wednesday.

After crawling 2,784 miles across America, Doc—Bob Wieland, formerly of Milwaukee—reached Wall 22 West, Line 47 of the Vietnam Veterans' Memorial where he found the name of Sgt. Jerome Deane Lubeno of Trevor, Wis., the man he set out to save in Vietnam June 14, 1969.

Lt. James Sylvester of Seattle, Wash., the last man to see Doc when he had legs, was at the wall. So were Dennis Cooper of Miller, Mo., who picked up Doc and carried him to a helicopter, and David De Nayer of Hume, Mo., the point man on that search and destroy mission.

Doc's parents, William and Ida Wieland of 5200 S. Tuckaway Blvd., Greenfield, Wis., walked the last mile of his walk for hunger and listened as he told, once again, what happened on that day in Vietnam.

"I stepped on and detonated an 82-millimeter mortar. It set me flying in one direction and my legs in the other," Wieland said.

There are 30 or 35 names—Sylvester said he lost track of the casualties—on the Viet-

nam Veterans' wall commemorating the men from the company Wieland served as a combat medic.

His buddies thought Doc was dead, but Cooper said, "We better get Doc on the chopper, he might still be alive."

In Vietnam, Cooper remembered, Wieland took care of children who were wounded. The parents "thought it would be nice to give him rice—the rice had bugs floating on top of it but he'd eat it. If that wouldn't kill him, nothing can," Cooper said. "I guess nothing could."

After years of rehabilitation, during which he became a record-setting weight lifter, Wieland began his trip across America Sept. 8, 1982, seated on a harness, propelling himself with his hands. He calculated that he took 4,900,016 steps in a walk for hunger—about 61,000 steps were sponsored to raise about \$300,000.

His mother said she worried about him, going across the country, but didn't doubt his determination.

"He was born that way, he seemed to have determination from an early age. As a 3-year-old, he had this desire to be a baseball player," she said.

He wanted to be in the major leagues and, by 1984, had reached top of semiprofessional baseball in Milwaukee. A left-handed pitcher, Wieland was rated the state's top professional prospect, according to his father.

At the memorial, there was a Marine color guard, a chaplain, a crowd of newsmen and dozens of people he'd met along the way.

"No one ever thought we'd get out of Los Angeles," Wieland said, describing the reaction of those he'd asked to sponsor "a guy with no legs who's going to walk across America on his hands."

Asked at the White House about another cross-country walk, Wieland said, "We're not going to do any reruns."

MISSION COMPLETED

VET'S INSPIRATIONAL WALK BRINGS REAGAN TO TEARS

(By John W. Kole)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Bob Wieland finished his "walk" across America at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wednesday and brought tears to the eyes of President Reagan while doing so.

As his parents, from Greenfield, Wis., watched from the grassy area near the Lincoln Memorial, Wieland made his way down the sloping walk, past the stark black granite slabs that contain the names of 58,000 Americans killed or missing in the Vietnam war.

Wieland, an Army medic during the war, had his legs blown off in June 1969 while trying to rescue another Wisconsin man, Jerome Lubeno, of Trevor in Kenosha County.

Wieland's goal was to walk across the United States from southern California to the granite panel containing Lubeno's name.

"It's been quite a journey," Wieland said as he neared his goal.

Long a physical fitness buff, Wieland spent years teaching himself to walk on his hands, using pads on his fists to propel his legless body. He recalled that the first time he completed a lap around a California gymnasium, "my muscles were so sore that I thought they all would fall off."

The often-interrupted journey started Sept. 8, 1982, at Knott's Berry Farms in southern California. In the three years, eight months and six days that followed,

Wieland figures he took almost 5 million steps, about a yard from each one.

Wieland, 40, who moved to California because the climate was better for his therapy, praised Reagan in a private White House meeting at which tears came to the president's eyes. Wieland appealed for help in his "Walk for Hunger" campaign.

The walk raised about \$300,000 in pledges for the cause, but that was far short of the \$25 million goal an enthusiastic Wieland had set. He vowed to continue raising money by giving speeches around the U.S.

Throughout the trip, Wieland and his helpers would stay in homes along the way. He would give inspirational speeches to pay expenses. Some of the families who provides shelter came here to watch him finish his trip.

So did some of those who were with him when his legs were blown off. One colleague, who had not seen him since 1969, said Wieland "looks a lot better now than he did when we loaded him on that chopper."

Among those at the memorial to pay tribute to Wieland's achievement were Reps. Gerald Kleczka (D-Wis.) and Christopher Smith (R-N.J.), and Jan Scruggs, leader of the Vietnam Veterans of America.

In March, Reagan appointed Wieland to the National Council on Physical Fitness and Sports. George Allen, the former professional football coach who is chairman of the council, paid tribute to Wieland in a letter.

"Bob's determination and perseverance are an inspiration to me," Allen said. "I don't know of any feat ever attempted that shows more physical and emotional output than this Walk for Hunger."

Reviewing the journey, Wieland said the most inspirational act came near the beginning of the journey when a small boy in Cathedral City, Calif., gave him 21 pennies.

"That little boy demonstrated that the smallest deed done is greater than the best intentions," Wieland said.

"You're not handicapped," Smith told Wieland. "You've got it all going for you."

NATIONAL TOURISM WEEK, MAY 18-24, 1986

● Mr. INOUE, Mr. President, for the third consecutive year Congress has designated the week beginning May 18, 1986, as National Tourism Week, and the President, has issued a proclamation accordingly. Inasmuch as the travel industry is our Nation's third largest and employs over 6 million men, women, and teenagers, it is most appropriate that the national theme for tourism week is "Tourism Works in America."

The goal of National Tourism Week is to make Government officials and consumers aware of just how important tourism is to the economic, social, and cultural welfare of the United States. This effort is headed by two very dedicated and outstanding tourism spokespersons for the Government and the industry—Donna Tuttle, Undersecretary of Commerce for Travel and Tourism; and Bill Edwards, president of AH&MA, and vice chairman of Hilton Hotels Corp. They are ably supported by the industry's National Tourism Week coalition and the

newly created, permanent industry National Tourism Week Office. This office is responsible for the overall coordination of industry-wide planning and observance of National Tourism Week. It was established by Travel Industry Association of America at the request of the following coalitions of the travel industry organizations: Air Transport Association; American Hotel & Motel Association; American Society of Travel Agents; National Tour Association; National Restaurant Association; Hotel Sales & Marketing Association International; Recreation Vehicle Industry Association; and Travel Industry Association of America.

Mr. President, this is just the latest in a series of substantial industry efforts over the past several years to impress upon the decisionmakers in Washington how important tourism is, and to form a partnership with the Federal Government to ensure that as a nation we capitalize on the industry's potential.

Even though the administration has once again recommended elimination of the modest but essential Federal tourism effort, I feel quite confident that Congress will once again insist that the U.S. Travel & Tourism Administration remain in business. And if we do, it will be another example of the Federal awareness which the travel industry is working so hard to achieve.

And so, as I have done on similar occasions in the past 2 years, I wish to suggest that during National Tourism Week we honor the millions of men, women, and teenagers who are the U.S. tourism industry.●

SHULTZ ASKS "MOST FAVORED SPENDING STATUS"

● Mr. HART. Mr. President, the administration incessantly decries Government spending, and suggests that all we need do to reduce the deficit is eliminate bloated bureaucracy. Yet, when it comes time to reduce spending, the first, loudest, and longest complaints are heard from the Secretaries of Defense and State, whose Departments have fared best among all agencies of Government these last 5 years.

This phenomenon—the demand for most favored spending status—was demonstrated again last week.

Secretary of State George Shultz demanded that foreign affairs funding be sharply increased, saying that a budget lower than that requested by the President would endanger Americans serving abroad. There are merits to the Secretary's argument; the tragic losses of military and foreign service personnel these past few years must not be allowed to happen again.

But Secretary Shultz is misdirecting his anger. By embracing Gramm-Rudman, this administration commit-

ted itself to a new budgetary regime: it can no longer campaign for national priorities without first finding the resources to pay for them. Yet, throughout the congressional budget process, which produced State Department funding levels the Secretary finds anathema, the administration stood on the sidelines. It refused to negotiate, refused to budge on revenues, and refused to find a middle ground on defense spending.

The distinguished chairman of the House Budget Committee, BILL GRAY, fashioned a Federal budget for 1987 that pleases few, but avoids the disastrous effects of across-the-board cuts otherwise required by Gramm-Rudman. The Secretary fails to recognize that his Department's budget fares better under the House or Senate-passed plans than under the Gramm-Rudman impoundment process.

As a recent editorial published by the Denver Post makes clear, Mr. Shultz should direct his appeals to the one man who can really make a difference: The President of the United States. I ask that this eloquent and forcefully written article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Denver Post, May 14, 1986]

JUST BRING THE MONEY BY

Secretary of State George Shultz opened a fight with Congress last week over cuts in U.S. foreign aid and overseas security which have been tentatively approved in Congress. Shultz talked about "a tragedy for U.S. foreign policy and national security."

Shultz has received what seems to us to be exactly the right reply from Rep. William H. Gray III, chairman of the House Budget Committee and an occasional target of criticism from the Reagan White House on the subject of federal spending.

"You want more money, you tell your president to bring it by," Gray told Shultz, as the two men talked angrily about the fiscal state of affairs.

The Shultz blowup over the threatened State Department budget cuts illustrates what has been true of the blinded fiscal policies of the Reagan administration for too long now:

It is never the spending favored by the administration—always Pentagon appropriations and now State Department outlays—which can or should be reduced. It is always some other budget, usually in a domestic program.

The Reagan White House, while preaching thrift in government, has presided over spending policies that have doubled the total federal debt, which now is more than \$2 trillion.

And as a former economics professor and a chief budget officer in the Nixon administration, Shultz knows that what Gray is saying is true. If the administration requires more overseas spending for important foreign aid and security programs, "... tell your president to bring it by." Whenever this administration asks for more money, it ought to say where it should come from.●

OUR GREATEST HERO OF THE 20TH CENTURY

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I wish to reiterate my concern over the plight of Dr. Andrei Sakharov, an outspoken advocate of human rights and world peace who has been exiled by Soviet authorities to the closed city of Gorky since January 22, 1980. The Nobel citation, awarded him in 1975, cited Sakharov as a "spokesman for the conscience of mankind." Meanwhile, the Soviet Government has gone to extraordinary lengths to silence him. Despite constant harassment by the secret police, Sakharov continues to champion the cause of human rights as embodied in the Helsinki Final Act and the United Nations Universal Declaration on Human Rights.

Two years ago Jason Robards portrayed Andrei Sakharov in a moving film presentation of the Nobel laureate's struggle for freedom in the Soviet Union. An article by Mr. Robards appearing in the Washington Post provides a good description of Sakharov's travail.

Mr. President, I request that the text of this article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

OUR GREATEST HERO OF THE 20TH CENTURY

(By Jason Robards)

Two years ago I played the role of Soviet human rights activist and Nobel Peace Prize laureate Andrei Sakharov. Glenda Jackson played the role of his wife, Dr. Yelena Bonner. We strained desperately to convey the feeling, the reality, the truth of the Sakharovs' experience as human rights activists and as political prisoners isolated in the closed and cold city of Gorky.

Through the whole process of studying for the part we felt an odd sort of detachment from the experience of Sakharov and Bonner, yet we pushed on.

Last week I was in Washington for the Helen Hayes Awards, special recognition of theater talent in the Washington area. During rehearsal on the afternoon of the awards, I learned that Dr. Bonner herself was in town for a meeting of the National Academy of Sciences and wanted to meet me. I, of course, said yes. She was to come to the awards ceremony.

Dr. Bonner arrived late from a meeting of the National Academy, where her husband was honored. She looked remarkably well for a woman who a few months earlier had undergone complicated surgery. I felt distraught and helpless that soon she would be returning to the Soviet Union with no guarantee of ever seeing her family here again.

She described to me the experience of her cab ride from the academy to the National Theatre. "As we were driving by the White House I had a strange, uneasy phantasmagoric feeling. I have just been to the National Academy of Sciences representing my husband, who was honored there, and now I am on the way to see a man who played the role of my husband, and at the same time, in the back of my mind I am packing my bags to return to the Soviet Union in less than a month. I wonder why I am not crazy."

Academician Sakharov, wherever he is, will celebrate his 65th birthday on May 21. Members of Congress have asked the president to proclaim that a day in honor of Sakharov, to be marked by "appropriate ceremonies and activities." To me, such a celebration—and it must be called a celebration, if we are to bring moral witness to Sakharov's great achievements—will be in part bizarre and in part harsh, cruel and real.

From Sakharov's writings I have learned that he believes that the world can be preserved only with the coexistence of peace and the rights of the individual, essentially what we in the West and so many brave souls in many places the world over call human rights. One of Sakharov's greatest achievements was persuading the Soviet government to sign the 1963 Moscow Treaty, which banned nuclear weapons testing in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water.

While many refer to Sakharov as the father of the Soviet hydrogen bomb, we forget to mention his ideas and efforts on the use of energy for peaceful purposes. He undertook this important work before he became a dissident and a spokesman for human rights. His first serious nonscientific work that became known in the West was called "Thoughts on Progress, Peaceful Coexistence and Intellectual Freedom" (1968). By the time of his Nobel Peace Prize lecture, which his wife delivered in Oslo in 1975, his views on human rights were crystallized.

While we as Americans are going to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the Statue of Liberty, we should call to mind Thomas Paine's response to Thomas Jefferson. Said Jefferson: "Where freedom is, there is my country." Paine replied: "Where freedom is not, there is my country."

Any celebration of Dr. Andrei Sakharov's birthday is bound to give rise to our worst fears—and our best hopes. But it must also be a time for us to commemorate with living testimony our greatest hero of the 20th century.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, as chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, I can attest to the fact that Sakharov has indeed become a hero, not by choice, but circumstance. Sakharov has not sought attention. The only thing that he has sought are the rights and freedoms we so often take for granted. Rights included in the Helsinki Final Act, freely agreed to by the leaders of the Soviet Union, and promised thereby to the people of the Soviet Union.

As President Thomas Jefferson noted, "The will of the people is the only legitimate foundation of any government." Unfortunately, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has chained and gagged the will of the Soviet people, while denying the possibility of its existence. Such actions not only raise serious questions regarding the Soviet Government's legitimacy, but also serve to drive them further outside of the community of civilized nations.

Mr. President, I encourage other Members of the Senate to join me in speaking out on behalf of those, like Sakharov, who seek to realize in their own countries those inalienable rights

we exercise and cherish, but which remain only a tragically denied potential for human greatness in those nations behind the Iron Curtain.●

AMERICAN PATRIOTISM

● Mr. QUAYLE. Mr. President, today I would like to honor a constituent who exemplifies the very meaning of the word "patriotism." Michael Haverly is an 8-year-old from Shelby County, IN, who for the last 3 years has worked hard raising money to repair the Statue of Liberty.

The son of Robert and Connie Haverly, Michael first became concerned about the fate of the Statue of Liberty when his mother read him a fundraising letter from the Liberty Foundation. Since that time, the second-grader at Trinton Elementary School has raised well over \$6,400 and has been honored for his efforts by President Reagan during a Rose Garden ceremony on October 28, 1985.

Later this year, Michael will take part in the Liberty Weekend festivities. He will be on the NBC-TV morning program, "Today," on July 4, and he will also be featured in a CBS-TV spot, "American Portrait," marking the statue's 100th birthday.

Michael, who has undergone numerous operations for multiple physical birth defects, is a prime example of a true American who has real pride in his country and its symbols of freedom. All Americans should take a cue from Michael and his unselfish dedication to repairing the Statue of Liberty. He says that, once completed, "her spirit will smile."

Today I would also like to share a letter dictated by Michael that he asked me to share with my colleagues:

DEAR SENATE PEOPLE: I know the times are rough, but I have run out of ideas, so I decided to write you.

Fixing our Statue of Liberty up has not been going so good. We need more money.

A long time ago she was shiny and pretty. Now she has rust coming down her neck and her arm is weak, and handicapped people in wheelchairs can't get in to see her.

If we don't fix her, people will think we don't care about our country.

You should be proud to be an American, so please donate as much as you possibly can. I don't care if it's a dollar or a thousand, and you can send it to me or the Statue people who are fixing it, like Sharyn Kay [a Liberty Foundation worker]. She is real nice.

And, can you please see if the children in Africa can get the food.

Thank you,

MICHAEL.

On the bottom of the letter, Michael has drawn a picture of the Statue of Liberty.

Mr. President, all of us in Indiana are very proud of our patriotic young Hoosier, and I know my colleagues join me in wishing Michael success in the final stretch before the statue is unveiled in July. I think I speak for all

WINNERS AND LOSERS OF TAX REFORM

● Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, since the Finance Committee reported out sweeping tax reform legislation on May 7, Americans have been busy trying to determine how this bill will affect their personal and business tax liabilities, whether they will be one of the "winners" or one of the "losers." Since May 7, I have discussed with industry representatives and with my constituents their specific concerns. I have also read with great interest numerous explanations of the impact of the Finance Committee bill on the U.S. economy. At this time, I would like to share with my colleagues one article I found to be particularly straightforward and objective. I urge those who have not yet done so to read the article which appeared in the May 26, 1986, edition of Business Week entitled, "The Winners and Losers of Tax Reform."

Mr. President, I ask that the text of the article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

THE WINNERS AND LOSERS OF TAX REFORM

The U.S. stands on the brink of a fundamental overhaul of its tax system. To the surprise of almost everyone, the tax bill now awaiting action in the Senate does much of what the reformers hoped to accomplish when President Reagan first proposed comprehensive tax revision in 1984. While a final bill is months away, it looks as though the U.S. will end 1986 with a shiny new tax code that will encourage investment for economic reasons, rather than tax advantages, as well as provide many individuals with more money to spend or save. By narrowing differences in how industries and individuals are taxed, this system would also be more equitable and efficient.

In the short run, some economists fear that the new plan could have a wrenching effect on investment by raising corporate taxes by \$100 billion over the next five years. But the transfer of that amount to individuals would largely offset the impact on the economy by fueling consumption. Investment would then be driven by the growth of markets rather than tax breaks. In addition, new constraints on consumer borrowing could lower interest rates, and that would eventually make more investment projects profitable.

POLITICAL MOMENTUM

Still, the bill approved by the Senate Finance Committee on May 7 could create real difficulties. If enacted, it would cause short-term confusion throughout the economy as businesses and individuals adjust to the new system. It threatens to wreck much of the commercial real estate industry, which already is in serious trouble (page 118), and it may radically change the way individuals save and invest. At the same time, it would wean individual taxpayers and companies away from their addiction to tax writeoffs and economically useless shelters and make the allocation of capital among industries more rational.

How does all this sort out for the taxpayer? There is no neat answer for everybody, but one thing is clear: If you pay a high effective tax rate today, you'll love the Finance Committee's version of reform. If you use lots of deductions and shelters to keep your rates low you'll hate it.

"The basic fact is that a trade-off of tax preferences for low rates is good for the economy in the long run," says David A. Berenson, director of tax policy at Ernst & Whinney. "There may be economic dislocations in achieving that, there will be winners and losers, but the macro effect is going to be good."

Because of the political momentum now building for a tax overhaul, the final version of reform is likely to look a lot like the Senate Finance bill, which sharply lowers both individual and corporate tax rates. But there could be changes. The repeal of the preferential treatment for capital gains, the curbs on individual retirement accounts (page 119), and the denial of deductions for sales taxes may face challenges, both on the Senate floor and in the eventual House-Senate conference committee.

In addition, there are key differences between the bill passed by the House last December and the Finance plan. The House measure makes relatively modest changes in individual taxation while greatly altering the treatment of business. It drops the top individual rate to only 38% and pays for most of the cuts by paring corporate deductions.

The Packwood bill takes a very different tack, making radical changes in individual taxation but qualitatively modest shifts in business taxes. It cuts the top individual rate nearly in half, to 27%, but pays for that by eliminating dozens of individual tax breaks. Corporate rates would be cut to 33% from 46%, financed mostly by curbs on corporate write-offs.

The Finance bill does not raise those taxes across the board. Instead, it creates crosscurrents of winners and losers, in some cases both giving to and taking away from the same companies.

SLEDGEHAMMER

The tax shelter industry, including most real-estate syndicators, probably hates the bill the most. It would prohibit taxpayers from using losses generated by limited partnerships to shelter other income, effectively locking out a prime source of real estate investment funds. In addition, lower rates make all tax preferences less valuable. And owners of commercial property would face far slower depreciation write-offs. "This is really a sledgehammer on real estate," declares J. Gregory Ballentine of Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co. The natural-resources-oriented Finance Committee could not restrain an urge to protect oil and gas shelters. But those write-offs, too, could be dumped before Congress is through with the package.

Other businesses, including established computer manufacturers, retailers, and wholesalers, stand to be big winners. Executives in these industries are delighted at the prospect of sharply lower tax rates. The Finance bill "really contains all the elements of tax reform that we've been campaigning for for years," says Larry R. Langdon, director of taxes for Hewlett-Packard Co. "It's as if someone here wrote it."

Computer startups, as well as other new ventures, may not fare as well. The proposed taxation of capital gains as ordinary income could discourage individuals from investing in speculative businesses. "It's a dis-

aster for long-term investing," complains Reid W. Dennis, a general partner at Institutional Venture Partners in Menlo Park, Calif.

Although corporations would continue to enjoy a modest capital gains differential, the shift in investment decisions by both individuals and businesses could prove to be among the most far-reaching effects of the Finance bill. "It's going to have some dampening effect on risk-taking," says Byrle M. Abbin, director of federal tax services at Arthur Andersen & Co. "If the [tax] rates are the same, the more conservative investor will say, 'Why should I even bother?'"

But like many of the bill's provisions, the capital gains change has its sweet side. While long-term capital gains rates would increase from a 20% maximum under current law to 27%—the same top rate as ordinary income—the six-month holding period now required to qualify for preferential treatment would disappear. Thus, investors would enjoy a big tax cut for short-term capital gains, which are now taxed at up to 50%. "That's got to be wonderful for Wall Street trading," says John H. Makin of the American Enterprise Institute.

The effect of the bill on autos is tougher to gauge. Auto makers are unhappy about the potential loss of the investment tax credit and the curb on their customers' interest deductions. But they are elated over the proposed \$100 billion tax cut for individuals. "Every car buyer would have a maximum 27% tax rate, which means more bucks to buy a car with," says Gerald Greenwald, chairman of Chrysler Motors Corp.

Capital goods manufacturers, and even some companies in the computer industry, may suffer an opposite effect. While the net impact on their taxes may be no worse than a wash, companies may find that their business customers, who could face higher taxes, may be reluctant to make big-ticket purchases. Over the long term, the Packwood bill should have little effect on capital cost recovery. The new depreciation schedules for equipment were designed so that faster write-offs would largely make up for the loss of the investment tax credit over the three- or five-year depreciation period.

FINE PRINT

The Finance bill, says Yolanda K. Henderson, an economist at the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, "makes for greater efficiency in the allocation of capital. The new bill raises the cost of capital, particularly for debt-financed investment. But it would lower the cost of equity financing, as well as for land and inventories." For business borrowers, the reduction in the corporate tax rate to 33% from 46% sharply lowers the value of their interest deductions. Conversely, the profits on equity are taxed at lower top rates at the corporate level and when distributed as dividends, which should make equity financing cheaper.

Other aspects of this bill may jolt both individuals and corporations as they check the fine print. Many analysts believe that the end to the deductibility of sales taxes, restrictions on tax-exempt bonds, and the likelihood that states will follow Washington in eliminating deductions without making comparable rate cuts will result in higher state and local income taxes.

In fact, the Finance bill itself produces a federal tax increase for 1987. Taxpayers will lose many deductions starting next Jan. 1, but the rate cuts are not scheduled to begin until six months later. "A lot of people who get a rate cut in later years will get a rate

increase next year," predicts Gillian M. Spooner, a partner in Touche Ross & Co.

The timing issue is a major concern to Lawrence Chimerine of Chase Economics, at least for the short term. "The stimulation to consumption will phase in slowly, whereas you'll see a sharp, quick cutback in investment projects due to the elimination of the ITC," says Chimerine. The short-term effects on investment also trouble Robert G. Dederick of Northern Trust Corp., but the former Commerce Dept. official notes: "The structural changes may well encourage more productive kinds of investment."

In addition, some economists worry that the Finance bill is too good to be true and that it could result in the same kind of huge revenue loss that the 1981 tax reduction did. For example, the repeal of the investment tax credit raises a lot of money over the next couple of years, but faster depreciation write-offs will be costly in the future. Similarly, the tax shelter provisions are expected to raise considerable revenue at first, but that could dry up as individuals find creative new ways to shelter their income. "This bill is nowhere near revenue-neutral. In later years it's going to be a hemorrhage," predicts Lee J. Seidler, a managing director at Bear, Sterns & Co.

Despite its problems, the Finance plan is a far better starting point for tax revision than most businesses ever expected. From the beginning of the reform debate, proponents have argued the need for a "level playing field." If the Finance bill doesn't exactly smooth the landscape, at least it's demolished most of the hills.—By Howard Gleckman in Washington, with Joan Berger, Elizabeth Ehrlich, and Norman Jonas in New York, and bureau reports.

DON'T CRY FOR THE ACCOUNTANTS

"My first reaction was that they're taking away my livelihood," says an Oregon CPA who just left a national accounting firm to set up his own tax practice. "But I don't think the new tax bill will make things all that simple."

Don't cry for the accountants. Or the tax lawyers. Or the publishers such as Commerce Clearing House Inc. and Prentice-Hall Inc. that produce thousands of pages on taxes every year. Although tax brackets would shrink from 14 to 2 for individuals and most deductions would be eliminated, the proposal creates enough complexity for business taxes to keep the army of tax people gainfully employed through the millennium. "The new alternative minimum-tax provision alone will provide an automatic annuity for the CPA profession," says Lee J. Seidler, a Bear, Sterns & Co. partner and former Price Waterhouse accountant.

MASS CONFUSION

There has never been an income-tax change that actually shrank the number of rules and regulations. This one, despite its billing, is no exception. Tax experts say that the Internal Revenue Code will actually grow from 1,700 to about 2,000 pages, and there will be mass confusion as businesses convert to the new system. "I'll bet there are a lot of corporations calling their accountants right now asking how they can get rid of their tax credits," says Arthur W. Bowman, editor of Public Accounting Report. "Business transactions are still complicated as hell," says Albert B. Ellentuck, national tax partner at Laventhol & Horwath.

To make sure those deals are reported properly, the bill boosts the annual IRS

budget from \$4 billion to \$6.5 billion over the next five years. And the plan drops 6 million low-income people from the tax rolls. So the government will have more resources to put the squeeze on fewer taxpayers, mostly businesses and wealthy individuals. Since 1966, the percentage of returns audited has slipped from 5% to 1.3%. The government hopes to reverse that trend, which will keep CPAs busy representing the increased number of clients doing battle with the IRS.

NO MORE SHOE BOXES?

True, the small, "boutique" CPA firms that specialize in analyzing aggressive tax shelters will have to diversify. "A client who has a seven-figure income will be less apt to shelter when the rate tops out at 27%," says Stuart Becker, a New York accountant with a cadre of clients in the entertainment field. "And that will hurt my business. But we're trying to expand our practice into personal financial planning and deemphasize the tax-oriented investment."

The hardest hit will be storefront income-tax offices and mass-production houses such as H&R Block Inc. that cater to the average wage earner. Block's stock price has fallen from 45 to 40 since the plan was announced. Company officials say that it is a "great misconception" that reducing the number to tax brackets or deductions will radically simplify the preparation of tax returns. But, if nothing else, people who would have otherwise taken their shoe boxes full of receipts to Block may think twice: The fee is no longer tax-deductible.—*By Stuart Weiss in New York, with Vicky Cahan in Washington and Mark Ivey in Denver.*

REAL ESTATE: SO LONG, SYNDICATORS

It's optimistic and incorrigibly self-promoting, but one thing the real estate industry has never been is speechless. Until now. The tax-reform plan of Senate Finance Committee Chairman Bob Packwood (R-Ore.) has most builders, developers, and syndicators shellshocked. Some deals are being hurried, others scotched, and many are suddenly in limbo. "There is a tremendous amount of confusion and uncertainty. It's very chaotic and frightening to a lot of people," says Stephen Roulac, an industry consultant in San Francisco.

As the industry sifts through the proposed changes, one thing seems clear: If it is passed intact, Packwood's bill will bludgeon an industry that is already badly bruised. How widespread the damage would be is impossible to calculate, but extraordinary overbuilding in the commercial market has made the industry less equipped to adjust to new rules than at any time in decades.

National vacancy rates for office buildings already have reached a debilitating 20.5%. But commercial space of all sorts now under construction—equal to a quarter of the space that already exists—will push them even higher, according to economist Robert A. Gough of Data Resources Inc. This massive overbuilding, predicts Chicago real estate mogul Samuel Zell, will create losses totaling \$60 billion to \$80 billion—and that's without considering the tax bill's effects. "There's going to be a lot of blood let," says Laventhol & Horwath partner Michael Amenta.

The \$12 billion real estate syndication industry will start bleeding first. Because the bill phases out investors' ability to apply paper losses from real estate against their other income, sponsors may try to combine existing loss-generating deals with income-producing partnerships. That way, the

losses wouldn't go entirely to waste. Still, as many as 40% of the country's syndicators—primarily small, private sponsors who devise aggressive tax shelters—could be badly hurt, according to Stanley Ross of accountants Kenneth Leventhal & Co.

"The ones who didn't diversify are going to be in real trouble" because they must continue to syndicate to survive, he says. Believing that even large, diversified sponsors will get stung, Wall Street drove syndicator Integrated Resources Inc.'s stock price down nearly 10 points, to 26%, in a few days.

Public limited partnerships usually rely less on tax benefits, though the elimination of the 20% capital-gains rate and a longer depreciation schedule will trim their yields. Their sponsors would suffer mainly because the bill limits the deductibility of individual retirement accounts, a prime sales outlet lately.

RADICAL SURGERY

By striking a lethal blow at "abusive" tax shelters with outside write-offs, the bill hits a choice target. But the fallout will include plummeting commercial property prices, reduced development, and an industry driven by drastically altered incentives. For years, a property's yield has consisted of cash flow from rents, price appreciation, and tax benefits. In knocking out the third leg, the bill completely changes the U.S. real estate market. And not all for the worse. "In the long run buildings will be built because they make sense, and I'm glad to see it," says one large developer.

The silver lining is that demand will have a chance to catch up with supply, says Arthur J. Mirante II, president and CEO of Cushman & Wakefield Inc. But first, commercial property values will fall because, without as many syndicators, there will be fewer buyers. Lower yields will discourage others and drive remaining buyers to lower their bids. "Any property that was valued primarily on the basis of tax benefits will have a material drop in value, perhaps as much as 20%," says Leventhal's Ross.

Texas would have to be declared a real-estate disaster area. Demand for distressed properties would dry up, because tax benefits offer the only persuasive argument for owning buildings that lack a solid cash flow. The real estate debacle could quickly explode into a banking problem. "It has the potential to be very severe," says a banking expert.

Meanwhile, the value of so-called institutional-grade properties with strong cash flows will probably hold up fairly well. Their owners, such as insurance companies and tax-exempt pension funds, have the money and patient to wait out bad times.

New construction, however, will slow dramatically. Already, "the flow of capital has come to a screeching halt," says J. McDonald Williams, managing partner of developer Trammell Crow Co. He says hundreds of development deals are floundering since Packwood's bill was born. While that halt is solely needed in the office-building market, it means many developers and construction workers will be idled.

Eventually, dwindling construction will allow landlords to raise rents somewhat, but rents would have to soar before construction begins anew. Says Trammell Crow's Williams: "To get the same net after-tax returns, you'd have to have a 35% increase in rents."

That goes for apartment buildings, too, but single-family homeowners can breathe easy. Most observers believe that those property values will go unscathed. Though a

27% tax rate makes mortgage interest and property-tax deductions less valuable to top-bracket taxpayers, such deductions will be among the few that survive. Chief Executive Michael A. Feiner of MDC Holdings Inc., the third-largest homebuilder, believes that lower interest rates and new stock and bond market wealth will fuel strong housing markets for at least six more months, tax bill or no.

The rest of the industry is anything but blasé. Once real estate regains its voice, you can depend on one thing about Packwood's bill: Congress will never hear the end of it.—*By Ellyn E. Spragins in New York.*

WHY THERE'S NO UPROAR OVER IRAS

Only a month ago, banks, thrifts, and financial service companies pitched individual retirement accounts to millions of taxpayers with an unprecedented barrage of full-page ads, junk mail, and phone calls. Banks and thrifts stayed open until midnight, and workers for some mutual fund companies catnapped at their desks to keep the phones working around the clock. By most counts, the campaigns paid off. Taxpayers added about \$40 billion in IRA assets this year, raising the nation's IRA pool to more than \$250 billion.

But the tax reform plan approved by the Senate Finance Committee would eliminate the tax deduction for IRA contributions for people covered by pension plans—a move that has already brought individual protests to Capitol Hill. Ironically, many companies that pursued IRAs as though their survival depended on them are barely protesting the loss of this potentially enormous business. "You have to look at the big picture," says Rupert H. Johnson Jr., senior vice-president of Franklin Resources, a \$22 billion mutual fund giant. "Here's a onetime shot at overhauling the tax system, and you have to consider the benefit for the country as a whole."

HARDLY ALTRUISTIC

Johnson's altruism aside, most financial service companies stand to gain handsomely from the new tax-reform proposal, and that's why protests are only perfunctory. The dramatic slashing of tax rates will more than make up for the loss of the broadly based IRA. Brokerage firms and mutual fund companies pay high taxes, and cutting their top rates will boost profits enormously. Under the new bill, Dreyfus Corp. would clear \$7.50 a share next year instead of a projected \$6.30, and Franklin's 1987 bottom line could improve from \$3 to \$3.75 a share, according to John Keefe, financial services analyst for Drexel Burnham Lambert Inc. Stock in Dreyfus and Franklin Resources declined since the tax plan was announced, but those companies' shares had been dropping since February.

Since the new bill allows earnings of existing IRAs and new nondeductible contributions to be tax-deferred, the industry will still push IRAs. Vanguard Group, a mutual fund giant, plans to shift its IRA sales strategy from promoting the tax deduction to highlighting the tax-deferral provision.

In addition, the business the financial service companies lose from managing IRAs could be picked up elsewhere—with interest. Lower taxes for individuals will leave them more dollars to save and invest. And since the new tax proposal quashes many tax-sheltered limited partnerships, more of those dollars are sure to end up in stocks, bonds, mutual funds, and life insurance products such as tax-deferred annuities.

Tax-exempt bonds, an enormous business for Wall Street brokerage houses and mutual funds, should be a likely beneficiary of money that otherwise would have gone into IRAs. "You'll see some securities-industry lobbying for IRAs," says Perrin H. Long, securities industry analyst for Lipper Analytical Securities Corp., "but it won't be very hard."

Banks, with 27% of the IRA funds, and thrift institutions, with 22%, could be expected to rally round this valuable source of deposits. Yet industry leaders praise the overall tax package for preserving favorable treatment for loan-loss reserves and lowering tax rates for individuals far more than they bemoan the loss of the IRAs. "Frankly, none of us ever made money on the IRAs because of the intense competition," confides a New York City banker. Since banks and thrifts pay at least the market interest rate on IRAs, they shouldn't have difficulty replacing those deposits.

LEARNING TO LOVE

Some mutual fund operators are fighting the IRA tax changes. Fidelity Investments, for one, has sent letters to all its customers urging them to write to their senators and congressmen. The Investment Company Institute, the funds' trade association, has launched a major public relations campaign urging taxpayers to do the same.

The biggest problem with defending the IRA, admit its supporters, is a lack of strong evidence that IRAs actually increase national savings. In fact, the savings rate dropped from 6.7% to 4.6% since the introduction of universal IRAs in 1982. David A. Wise, a Harvard University economist, argues that half the IRA contributions is money that otherwise would have been spent, but this view is not widely shared.

The ordinary folks who've grown fond of the IRA as an easy way to shelter \$2,000 of income may not give up on IRAs as easily as the industry. If constituents howl loudly enough when their legislators return home for the Memorial Day break, they could force Congress into preserving the deduction in some form. But so far there's been no groundswell of taxpayer protest. It may be that the general public has already learned to love the Packwood package.—By Jeffrey M. Laderman in New York, with bureau reports.●

JERRY SCHALLER

● Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, with the other members of the Minnesota delegation and many others in our State and Nation, I have recently mourned the passing of a talented and compassionate man, Jerry Schaller. Many of us knew Jerry Schaller through his professional activities, his work on Capitol Hill as an aide to Congressman Karth, Senator Humphrey, and Senator Mondale. We also knew him through his work for the Minnesota-based 3M Corp. and his presidency of Joint Action in Community Service, Inc. [JACS], an innovative organization devoted to assisting graduates of the Job Corps Program to carry out what they have learned.

However, it is important for all of us who knew and respected Jerry, and he was well known and certainly respected in this town, to look at the personal side of Jerry's life, to understand the

energy and commitment that fueled his efforts in his professional life. At Jerry's funeral mass in late March a eulogy was delivered by his friend and colleague, George Spellman, one of Jerry's coworkers at JACS, which I would like to share with all of you. It takes us a step closer to realizing what a great friend we had among us. I ask that following my statement the Spellman eulogy be printed in full.

The statement follows:

EULOGY

Reverend Father Byron, reverend fathers, relatives, distinguished guests, and friends of Jerry Schaller.

When thinking about preparing a eulogy for Jerry Schaller, one must begin by thinking clearly about Jerry and his relationships to organizations and to people. By knowing what Jerry did—can lead us to discover who he was. And as we all know, he did so many things for so many people in the short period of his sixty years.

His litany of organizations included political, charitable, business, educational and professional groups. It was not that Jerry was a "joiner," for he spent a great deal of energy deciding which associations were worthwhile of his time and talents, his gifts, and graces, but it was because he believed in organizations and institutions with noble objectives.

Primarily, Jerry was a very good politician. He loved working "the Hill." He knew that wonderful things could be achieved by the political process and spent most of his adulthood in this arena. He was a very proud Democrat and worked zealously on behalf of his party on both the State and national levels. He served Congressman Karth and both Senators Humphrey and Mondale with distinction.

Jerry was a professional Washington representative of the 3M Co. Not only was he a proud member of the corporate team, he was a founding board member of the Bryce Harlowe Foundation which seeks to promote standards of excellence in lobbying activities.

While at 3M, many of us received the ditty box at Christmas, just in time to use the 3M tapes on our Christmas wrappings—a very thoughtful and practical gift. And although Jerry was a part of 3M management, he remembered being raised in the labor movement and always believed that organized labor played a vital part in our economy to promote free enterprise. What other person do you know who read the great social encyclicals—*rerum novarum*, *quadragesimo anno* and *pacem in terris*?

Jerry spent a lot of time doing things he enjoyed. He loved his flowers and garden; he enjoyed playing golf and strolling down the fairways of the Argyle Country Club. He couldn't hit the ball very far but truly enjoyed winning a \$2 Nassau with a very fine putter. He was an avid Redskin fan and loved to attend those brisk Sunday afternoon games which reminded him of Minnesota. One of his favorite activities was talking and debating—once when he had his throat operated on a few years ago, his worse punishment was not being able to talk for a week. All of us welcomed the break. Have mercy on us.

The finest part of his character shone clearly forth as the volunteer president of Joint Action in Community Service [JACS]. JACS helps young people after their job corps training. Jerry wanted to be part of

this volunteer program and always talked about JACS and the Job Corps. He served admirably for the past twelve years. That was Jerry Schaller—always helping and caring—getting someone a job; giving money; getting money for worthwhile causes; understanding the relationship between philanthropy and voluntarism. He had a consummate sense of justice and knew that charity could only be practiced after justice was served. He was involved in helping the marginal populations; he cared about race relations; he worked quietly in the women's movement and had a very special place in his heart for the poor and the underprivileged. He believed everybody should have a second chance in our society no matter what their social status. He was so recognized by his alma mater St. Thomas in 1982 as the recipient of their humanitarian award.

Finally, Jerry was a good husband and father and grandfather. With those he loved, he had very high expectations of them and of himself. Oh, there were times when he would yell and give commands. Yet he always made time for those he loved and those who needed him. His good humor and quick smile added to that relationship.

So, when thinking about Jerry and his relationships to organizations and people, we come to placing all his activities within the context of his deep abiding faith in his God and in his church. He was truly a Vatican II Christian.

Over the past several years, Jerry would make his Easter retreat to Loyola on the Potomac to spend a few days in prayer and meditation in preparation for Easter. In fact, today is the day his colleagues would leave for Loyola to pray. Jerry believed in the resurrection and now has experienced the promise of Christ. His life has not ended: It has been changed.

You have taught us much, Jerry Schaller, and we thank you. It is my fervent wish that we will continue to live a life of caring which you showed us how to live.—George F. Spellman, executive vice president, JACS.●

IN REMEMBRANCE OF TERRY REILLY

● Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention an individual who I had the good fortune to know, albeit briefly, and his significant contributions to improving rural health care in this country. Terry Reilly, of Nampa, ID, was tragically killed in a plane crash a few weeks ago. He was traveling throughout the State, campaigning for lieutenant governor, when his plane went down.

Terry testified at a rural health hearing I held in Minneapolis early in April. He impressed me there as an intelligent, caring, and dedicated individual.

Running for lieutenant governor of Idaho was only the most recent example of Terry's commitment to public service. He also made many worthwhile contributions to rural Idaho that deserve mention, Mr. President.

Since 1971, Terry had been the administrator of Community Health Clinics, Inc., in Nampa, ID, a nonprofit

health corporation that operates five family practice medical clinics throughout the State and also is involved with a home health agency, a rural consortium of mountain clinics, a drug store, and two sexual abuse treatment centers. I explain this, Mr. President, to illustrate the fact that through Terry's leadership, Community Health Clinics, Inc., furthered its commitment to providing rural health care in communities where no other health care exists, in a State that has only one city with a population over 50,000.

Terry was also a leader in focusing national attention on rural health care. He offered his experience and expertise to the National Rural Health Care Association, as a founding member and past president of that organization.

Mr. President, Terry Reilly will, of course, be missed very much by his family and friends. His death is also a significant loss to those who have been the beneficiaries of his leadership in rural health care, both in Idaho and throughout our country. ●

NAUM AND INNA MEIMAN: 10 YEARS OF STRAIN

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, Naum and Inna Meiman are personal friends of mine who reside in the Soviet Union. They have asked to leave the Soviet Union to emigrate to Israel, but they have been refused many times.

Naum is a mathematician by profession and performed calculations for his job 25 years ago. Despite the fact that these calculations are outdated, Naum continues to be told that he possesses state secrets, a ridiculous claim. Inna has been told that she cannot leave to obtain medical treatment because she has lived with Naum, the possessor of state secrets for too long. Naum and Inna have been married for 5 years, 20 years after Naum did his calculations.

The Meimans are an elderly, sick couple whose only desires are to emigrate to Israel and to see their daughter, Olga, who lives in the West.

I strongly urge the Soviets to allow the Meimans to emigrate to Israel. ●

HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION

● Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, last July I introduced S. 1494, a bill which would amend the 1965 Highway Beautification Act to make it at last an effective mechanism for regulating billboards. Twenty-one years after the enactment of the original act, the visual pollution alongside our Nation's highways has grown steadily worse. State and Federal taxpayers have spent \$2 million thus far to be rid of this roadside pollution. All we have gained is an increase in the number of billboards to the point where we have 14 billboards

for every 10 miles of Federal highway, and over 150,000 of those billboards are illegal or nonconforming.

I am happy to report that the battle to reform our billboard laws is not being fought by an unusual and broad-based coalition including, the Reagan administration, the Sierra Club, the National Wildlife Federation, the National Audubon Society, the American Institute of Architects, the National Taxpayers Union, the National League of Cities, the American Society of Landscape Architects, the Environmental Defense Fund, the Environmental Policy Institute, the Garden Clubs of America, the Izaak Walton League, the National Parks and Conservation Association, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the Natural Resources Defense Council, Preservation Action, and the Wilderness Society.

In a recent letter, the Secretary of Transportation, Elizabeth Dole, strongly endorsed the reforms contained in S. 1494 and stated that she "wholeheartedly agrees that the current law is unworkable and in great need of change." Secretary Dole's strong support is indicative of the sentiment across the country that now is the time to make these billboard reforms the law.

Mr. President, I am including a copy of the letter from Secretary Dole which I respectfully request be printed in its entirety in the Record after my statement.

S. 1494 will change the present law in several ways. First, the bill would replace a moratorium on the construction of new billboards in urban areas, similar to the present ban on constructing billboards in rural areas. The ban would not apply to the types of signs that are presently exempted in the act, such as directional signs, or on-premise advertising. The bill would also eliminate an enormous loophole that permits billboards to be built in rural unzoned commercial or industrial areas, despite the clear intent of the act to ban the construction of new billboards in rural areas.

The billboard industry has enjoyed the unusual position, as polluters of the Nation's highways, of being paid not to pollute. A 1978 amendment sponsored by the billboard industry requires billboard owners to be compensated in cash for the removal of billboards that are nonconforming because of the act. The General Accounting Office found that often billboard owners do not actually remove the billboards for which compensation has been paid. Additionally, the billboards proposed for compensation are ones that have ceased to be valuable to the billboard owner because of changes in the highway system, and likely would have been abandoned anyway.

This subsidy of the industry is particularly egregious in these times of severe budgetary constraints. S. 1494 will remove the requirement to compensate in cash for the removal of nonconforming signs and will authorize the use of amortization as a means of compensation. The General Accounting Office has estimated that the financial liability for the cash compensation provision could total nearly \$1 billion. Additionally, removal of this requirement will return to State and local governments the ability to impose stricter regulations on billboards than they are presently able to.

This Nation spends hundreds of millions of dollars every year to protect natural and scenic areas for their wildlife, recreation, scenic, and other natural resource qualities. We clean up polluted water and air and control obtrusive noise. Yet, billboards remain a virtually unchecked blight on the Nation's highways. I am optimistic that—with the backing of this dedicated coalition—we have a good chance of finally winning the battle against billboards.

The letter follows:

THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, DC, April 11, 1986.

HON. SLADE GORTON,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SLADE: Thank you for your letter concerning reforms to the Highway Beautification Act. I agree with you wholeheartedly that the current law is unworkable and in great need of change.

When I testified before the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works on March 6, I emphasized the importance of reforming the highway beautification program. We must end the federal compensation requirement and allow state amortization laws to control. We must reduce the cost of the program to taxpayers. We must tighten limitations on construction of new billboards in rural areas, where billboards intrude upon natural beauty. Equally important, we must end inappropriate interference with state and local zoning laws and billboard removal programs. We must simplify the program's administration.

The Department supports your efforts to gain enactment of these provisions, as well as other provisions consistent with our approach. Your efforts are even more important in light of changes considered by the House last year which would place additional financial burdens on taxpayers and perpetuate the current unworkable program which adds little to scenic beauty.

I look forward to working with you and other members of the Senate who understand the high cost and small benefit of continuing the current highway beautification program to gain inclusion of mutually acceptable provisions in the Senate's highway bill.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of these views to the Congress.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH HANFORD DOLE. ●

● Mr. EVANS. Mr. President, the Highway Beautification Act of 1965, launched with great fanfare and hope

to rid the American highway landscape of billboard blight has become instead a Billboard Protection Act. Drilled full of holes by the billboard industry, the act encourages billboards in zoned and unzoned commercial and industrial areas, and now more billboards are going up than coming down. In 1978, the billboard industry got the Congress to require that all States pay cash compensation to billboard owners for the removal of nonconforming billboards even if it was State or local law that made the signs nonconforming.

Before Congress stopped providing appropriations for this purpose in 1982, over \$200 million in Federal and State matching funds were handed over to billboard owners, providing them the opportunity to use these cash payments to put up bigger billboards along the same stretch of highway from which the nonconforming signs were removed. This ingenious recapitalization scheme ended when appropriations were cut off, but the cash compensation requirement remains. As a result, removals of nonconforming signs have ground to a virtual halt. Today, according to the Federal Highway Administration, 112,000 nonconforming signs remain standing 20 years after implementation of the act. Because the law applies this cash compensation requirement to signs declared nonconforming under State and local law, as well as Federal law, State and local land-use powers have been undercut. Both the General Accounting Office and the Department of Transportation's Inspector General have documented the act's deficiencies and failures and pointed the way toward reforms.

Legislation I introduced last year along with Senator GORTON, S. 1494, would produce the reforms that the highway beautification program sorely needs. Its provisions include a ban on the erection of new off-premise billboards along Federal-aid highways. It would repeal the law's cash compensation requirements, turning back to States and localities their authority to regulate billboards. It would also prohibit several outrageous abuses permitted under the law, including the erection of billboards in phony, unzoned commercial and industrial areas and the billboard company practice of making signs more visible by chopping down publicly purchased trees, shrubs, and other landscape materials on the public right of way.

Senator GORTON's and my efforts to stop billboard pollution date back to 1961 when we shepherded a major billboard control law through the Washington State Legislature. Other States have passed billboard control laws since then. Unfortunately, the Federal Government has actually impeded State efforts to remove unsightly billboards.

In recent months, the public has awakened to the fact that the failure of the Highway Beautification Act is turning our highway landscapes into visual slums. The public outcry against this pollution is reflected in the increasing attention that newspaper editors have paid to the problem. In newspapers large and small, editors are calling for an end to the game of billboard shuffleboard that the billboard companies have established in the law. I would like to share with my colleagues a number of editorials that have appeared over the last year or so to demonstrate the growing public support for action to halt billboard blight. I ask that these editorials be printed in the RECORD.

The editorials follow:

[From The Washington Post, May 3, 1986]
BILLBOARD INDUSTRY EYES LOCAL OFFICIALS

Campaign contributions and posh junkets for members of Congress—courtesy of the powerful billboard industry—have been the subject of recent columns. At least one sign company has been discussing how to reward its friends and punish enemies at the local level as well.

Our associate Stewart Harris obtained a copy of tactics discussed by Naegele Outdoor Advertising Co., third largest in the country, during a company seminar in Minneapolis four years ago. A Naegele spokesman insists that the ideas were presented only for "discussion purposes" and that Naegele doesn't use them.

Among the suggestions were to give the local mayor free billboard space for his favorite charity. "The mayor (being a politician) will recognize the value of being able to get credit for favors to various civic-minded persons," the agenda explained.

Critics accuse the industry of using variations of this tactic, as when a billboard company fighting a court suit in Des Moines erected a sign saying: "A Shriner never stands so tall as when he stoops to help a crippled child."

The judge presiding over the billboard suit was a Shriner in the neighborhood where the sign was posted, according to the Des Moines city attorney.

During the Naegele seminar, company executives discussed ways to oppose anti-billboard campaigns. The agenda included such things as the number of votes required on a city council, the mayor's and city attorney's ability to help—and a cryptic question: "Bribe suggested?"

The last was on the agenda as a "preventive measure" so company officials would know how to turn down a city official proposing a bribe, the spokesman said.

For the record, a two-year FBI investigation in North Carolina led to the 1985 conviction of a Naegele official there on charges that he ordered company employees to falsify their income tax forms to avoid taxes on bonuses they had passed along to local politicians as campaign contributions.

Footnote: Until last fall, a media conglomerate called Ackerley Communications had been a good friend to the American Heart Association. The company for years had given the association free billboard space for its public service announcements.

But then the Heart Association stepped over the line: It voiced its opposition to billboard advertising of cigarettes. The tobacco industry, along with the liquor and airline

industries, is one of the major clients of billboard companies like Ackerley.

In a memo dated Nov. 14, 1985, a top Ackerley official instructed the company's billboard, radio and television subsidiaries to cease the donation of air time or billboard space to the Heart Association.

"Their position on cigarette advertising is not compatible with our company," the memo explained. "Please consider this to be the same as the American Cancer [Society]; we will no longer give either organization any support."

Ackerley rescinded the memo so fast that the Heart Association never noticed any interruption in the posting of their public service announcements on airport billboards.

[From the Durham (NC) Herald, May 4, 1986]

THE BILLBOARD SUBSIDY

Strange, isn't it, how government's solutions turn into costly problems? That has been the legacy of Lady Bird Johnson's highway beautification program.

It began as a beautification program to chase billboards off the sides of federally financed highways. But the billboard industry's lobby has finessed Congress into making beautification as subsidy for the sign-makers.

Here is what has happened. The 1965 law was intended to clear the nation's highways of unsightly signs. The billboard industry has wrangled out of Congress loopholes that allow the federal government to pay for sign removal. So far, the government's cost has been \$200 million.

Indeed, signs have been removed—the ones the sign companies didn't want because of location, condition or visibility. While the government has subsidized their removal of unwanted signs, they have continued to put up new ones, often clearing out lovely trees to make them visible.

The result has been no fewer signs. In fact, the twists in the beautification act have made government an accomplice to the visual assault.

It's time to get back to the original intent of the Highway Beautification Act. Sen. Slade Gorton, R-Wash., has introduced legislation that would do that. He would end the federal subsidy for sign removal, ban new billboards along federally subsidized highways and prohibit tree-cutting to make signs more visible. His bill also would give state and local governments more leeway to crack down on unsightly signs.

The billboard industry is fighting the Gorton bill, as one might expect, but the bill is gathering support. One endorsement came from Elizabeth Dole, Secretary of Transportation, who says she would like to end the "perpetual subsidy" and signs that "violate our landscape and assault our senses wherever we turn."

We agree.

END THE BILLBOARD SUBSIDY

It's time to discontinue Lady Bird Johnson's highway beautification program, which has been transformed into a device to subsidize the billboard industry.

The intent of the 1965 law was entirely worthwhile. The legislation was aimed at clearing the nation's highways of unsightly signs. But because of loopholes and amendments pushed through Congress by the billboard lobby, the act simply isn't working as planned.

The federal government has spent nearly \$200 million to compensate billboard compa-

nies for removing signs. But almost as fast as the billboards come down, new ones sprout up.

Under the current law, the federal government puts up 75 percent of the cost of compensating companies for sign removal, with states and local governments contributing the other 25 percent. What happens in many cases is that billboard owners take down their least profitable signs and erect new ones at other locations. Sometimes, companies take the money to remove signs and simply leave them standing.

In addition, billboard firms frequently cut trees and other foliage on highway rights of way so their signs can better be seen.

The federal law also is tying the hands of states and municipalities that want to get tougher with billboard owners.

Sen. Slade Gorton, R-Wash., has introduced legislation to change the law. He would end the federal subsidy for sign removal, ban new billboards along federally subsidized highways, prohibit tree cutting to make signs more visible, and give state and local governments more leeway to crack down on unsightly signs.

The billboard industry is fighting the Gorton bill, for good reason. Not only have the sign companies succeeded in defanging Lady Bird Johnson's highway beautification legislation, but they also have so far reaped a \$200 million windfall from the federal government.

But Gorton's proposal has just received an endorsement from Secretary of Transportation Elizabeth Dole. Maybe between the two of them, they can end what Gorton calls a "perpetual (federal) subsidy to the billboard industry to remove signs that violate our landscape and assault our senses wherever we turn."

THE NEED TO CONTROL BILLBOARDS

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, July 22, 1985]

In defense of the indefensible, people often come up with ridiculous arguments. Defending signs and billboards from reasonable regulation on the grounds that a sign ordinance interferes with freedom of speech is an example of sublime ridiculousness.

It is the equivalent of defending the right of a drunk to yell at passers-by on the grounds of freedom of speech.

The proliferation of monster billboards and signs has finally got the goat of Charleston City Council and at their last meeting, on Tuesday night, they got around to doing something about this blight on our otherwise fair city. Council has been talking about action for a long time now, so it was encouraging to see a unanimous vote—with the inexplicable abstention of Councilman Baker. But the new sign ordinance faces considerable opposition and Tuesday's meeting merely gave it initial approval. Although it would outlaw about half the existing signs in the city, we consider the measure conservative.

For far too long, the city's authorities and its inhabitants have been putting up with ugly, oversized signs and billboards. Although they are silent, they are the visual equivalent of obscene remarks. People should be protected from such assaults on their senses. Far from interfering with freedom of speech, the proposed ordinance would protect our human rights from daily violation.

[From the Baltimore (MD) Sun, May 20, 1985]

NEW FIGHT AGAINST BILLBOARDS (By Neal R. Peirce)

HOUSTON.—Texas-scale antidote is shaping up for a glaring failure of the Great Society era—the Highway Beautification Act, a proven paper tiger against the thousands of billboards blighting America's highways.

Passed at the behest of Lady Bird Johnson, then First Lady, the 1965 law has turned into a textbook case of how a law can be gutted by the industry it's supposed to regulate.

In 1978, the sign barons pushed through Congress an amendment requiring government compensation for any billboard removed under state and local control laws. That hobbled local controls but escalated costs so drastically that appropriations dried up.

The billboard companies pocketed millions of federal dollars paid them to remove offending signs—probably using the money to erect more signs elsewhere. The number of billboards on federally funded highways has soared to over a half-million. Now we have jumbo signs—up to a house-sized, 2,500-square-foot ones.

Are billboards necessary—as the sign lobby claims—to economic prosperity? Hardly: Hawaii, Vermont and Maine, the three states that banned the boards altogether, have done swimmingly without them. For tourists, small uniform signs with commercial logos are a welcome—and reliable substitute.

Billboards may start toppling elsewhere as a broad-based citizen movement to curb the signs grows. Even heavyweight developers who see their own projects imperiled by the signs have joined.

Texas is in the lead, Houston, first in America in billboards per capita, passed a law in 1980 limiting sign height and size as of 1986. The billboard lobby in 1983 persuaded the Texas Legislature to require cash compensation by cities to owners of banned signs. Governor Mark White vetoed the bill; this spring the billboard lobby is pushing it again in Austin.

But now Houston has more allies. Rita Ellison, the scrappy executive director of Billboards Limited, claims support from an array of Texas cities that have also proclaimed billboard moratoria—Dallas, Fort Worth and Austin among them. San Antonio Mayor Henry Cisneros has organized the Texas Municipal League behind the fight.

Atlantans, worried about an onslaught of billboards (doubled to 3,000 in the last five years), have been stymied by the billboard lobby. But Tulsa homeowners showered Mayor Terry Young with protest signatures bearing 7,000 signatures, and Mr. Young pushed through a billboard moratorium that approved most of the controls a study commission recommended. And Orlando, Fla., has a new city report recommending major stiffening of its sign ordinance.

But when cities put in controls, suburbs rarely show enough sophistication to follow suit. The prospect, as cities reduce the boards and regain control of their vistas, is that they'll be billboard-free islands surrounded by rings of visual pollution.

Not a single victory over the signs has come without a bitter, dragged out fight with the billboard lobby. It's hard to think of a tougher—and more often successful—pressure group than the Outdoor Advertising Association of America. Its political power ranges from Congress to the influ-

ence it carries through targeted contributions in city council races.

In one local fight after another, the billboard lobby has packed hearing rooms, intimidated opponents, and when defeated, has litigated nonstop to prevent controls from taking effect. Local media often don't take up the cudgel. They also advertise on billboards, or are tied to parent corporations with billboard subsidiaries.

Polls show a solid majority of Americans for billboard controls. But until the recent citizen revolt, with its critical business allies, got started, their voices have usually gone unheeded. Now a Coalition for Scenic Beauty, its Center for Sign Control headquartered in Washington, is coordinating anti-billboard efforts nationally.

One senses the billboard gang has reached the zenith of its power, while the anti-forces are just gaining steam. They say that commercial sign controls aren't, as claimed, an illegal "taking" or infringement of free speech, but rather legitimate city action, affirmed by the Supreme Court, to protect citizens from "visual assault"—and add that intrusive, often mammoth, signs are the only users of public highway rights-of-way that don't pay user fees. They say the sign lobby, in states from Tennessee to California even has gained power to chop down trees—in California a beautiful eucalyptus stand was destroyed—to make sure motorists see their signs instead of the scenery.

Victories for the citizen billboard-control groups come painfully, slowly. But it's hard to believe Americans won't soon demand a purge of the unsightly billboards.

[From the Atlanta Constitution Dec. 12, 1983]

BILLBOARD INFESTATION GROWING WORSE

I think that I shall never see
A billboard as lovely as a tree.
Indeed, unless the billboards fall,
I'll never see a tree at all.

Or words to that effect by Ogden Nash. Or maybe it was Samuel Hoffenstein. Somebody like that.

So now comes word—and who is surprised by it?—that the infestation of billboards in Atlanta continues apace; indeed, is accelerating. The suppose billboard-control ordinance enacted by the City Council last year was fabricated from loopholes, written as much by the billboard industry as by the Council. It was a billboard-adding law, not a billboard-subtracting one.

Just look around (if you can). City Hall, handed out 470 permits last year. This year, it has issued 701, with the greatest increase in the biggest signs. The number of permits rose by 126 from 1981 to '82. It has jumped by 231 so far this year. Some control.

The Urban Design Commission, with broad support from civic, business and neighborhood groups, has called for a six-month moratorium on billboard construction and for stricter regulations. The moratorium may be impractical, but increased restrictions—and sharply increased at that—are impractical only if the Council remains more solicitous of the billboard lobby than of the city's good looks and the interests of its residents and visitors.

Cobb County is considering strong new regulations, before the situation gets out of hand. Fulton and DeKalb counties allow just five billboards per mile of roadway, and then only on U.S. and state highways. Decatur banned them in 1974.

Atlantans are bear-people. We live in the woods. Our trees are one of the city's great-

est charms and most pleasing (and cost-efficient) amenities. We shouldn't deny ourselves, or others who are visiting us, the pleasures of seeing them.

And if the billboards keep kudzooming, growing like weeds and higher looming, there's something else we soon won't see: From corner to corner along Peachtree.—Anonymous.

[From the News-Sentinel, Knoxville, TN, Jan. 11, 1985]

BEAUTIFICATION BACKFIRES

Imagine a federal program that paid a company to stop polluting in one place but allowed it to turn around and do the same nearby.

Now stop imagining and meet the highway beautification program. This legacy of Lady Bird Johnson's initiative may be the best thing that ever happened to the billboard industry, which some regard as being in the business of visual pollution.

While companies have been pocketing millions in federal dollars, thank you, to remove offending signs, they simultaneously have erected even more signs elsewhere. The net effect: Many roads stay cluttered and highway beautification often remains a distant dream.

It wasn't supposed to work that way. Part of the problem lies in sheer neglect to enforce the law. But the law itself is flawed, too, full of loopholes that permit the billboard industry to conduct a shell game: Take one sign down here but put up another there.

Two recent reports, by the Transportation Department and the General Accounting Office, spell out the magnitude of the failure. Nearly \$200 million has been spent in compensation for the removal of signs, but nearly half a billion more would be required to take down the remaining billboards officially listed as "non-conforming." And even that wouldn't end the problem.

Fortunately, not all is bleak in the world of billboard pollution. Six states have banned billboards altogether. Others have imposed stringent size and placement standards, or, like Florida, restricted them from some highways.

Many local governments have done their part, too.

In fact, given the confused state of the law, it's wise the Reagan administration hasn't asked for money for the program since 1982. If more is to be spent, a moratorium is needed on highway billboard construction. In addition, billboard operators ought to be denied the privilege to cut down foliage on public land. In states such as Louisiana, stretches of trees as long as 2,000 feet have been clearcut so that motorists can see signs.

The same thing is happening in the Knoxville area and many News-Sentinel readers have complained about it.

Perhaps the best recommendation comes from the Transportation Department: Scrap the compensation program and adjust the law so that states can require the removal of signs after owners have amortized their cost.

Considering the disappointing results of nearly \$200 million spent so far, why risk more than twice that much in the future?

[From the Courant, Hartford, CT, Feb. 2, 1985]

HIGHWAY UGLIFICATION

The results of a 20-year government campaign to beautify main U.S. highways by re-

moving billboards are discouraging. Two federal reports show not just disappointing progress, but significant regression. The chief culprits seem to be congressional plicancy and executive branch lethargy (or apathy), but the billboard lobby is a factor, too.

Since passage of the Highway Beautification Act of 1965, nearly \$200 million has been spent by the federal government to compensate billboard owners who took down their signs. What's to be shown for the effort and expense? The absence of about 600,000 billboards that once cluttered the landscape along interstate and primary U.S. highways.

Unfortunately, something else is also showing the almost 200,000 illegal and non-conforming billboards that are still standing beside those roads. Also painfully evident are the crews that have been putting up new billboards faster than the old ones could be taken down.

The reports suggest that the federal government, even while trying to control billboard proliferation, has also been stimulating it. The U.S. Department of Transportation's inspector general said compensated billboard owners often used the money to erect new signs, sometimes on the highways where their old ones had stood.

Both the DOT report and a report by the General Accounting Office, an arm of Congress, noted that the law was so feeble that it often allowed billboard companies, in order to make their signs easier to see, to destroy trees and shrubs that had been planted for beautification.

Sometimes state money helped pay for cutting down the plantings.

Loopholes weren't the only problem. The executive branch, the reports indicated, hasn't aggressively monitored state enforcement of the beautification act, and they said too little has been allocated for enforcement during the Reagan administration.

About \$500 million would be needed to remove the remaining billboards, the GAO report said, but only \$15 million is earmarked for that purpose. Nor does the Reagan administration seem interested in enforcing the law: Since 1982, it hasn't sought any money for the beautification program.

Expecting a new enforcement effort would be naive, but a recommendation in the DOT report could help: Instead of continuing to pay billboard owners for removing signs, the report says, state or local governments should be given the power to simply order billboards taken down after giving owners time to amortize their investment.

Although amortization is a fair and effective approach, the billboard lobby probably would vigorously oppose it, since it could cut into profits. But if such a step can regain some of the ground lost in the war against visual pollution along the nation's highways, it's worth taking.

[From the Times-Union, Rochester, NY, Jan. 14, 1985]

BILBOARDS OUT OF CONTROL

The Highway Beautification Act of 1965, a pet project of Lyndon and Lady Bird Johnson, was supposed to make the nation's highways more scenic and perhaps safer by removing unsightly billboards. Nearly 600,000 have been removed.

However, say recent reports by the General Accounting Office and the Department of Transportation, some 200,000 illegal billboards still stand, and more signs are going up than down.

Billboard owners have been paid \$200 million in compensation for removing their signs. But some never took them down, and some used the money to put up new signs just down the road.

How could this happen?

Partly because federal enforcement has been lagging; partly because many local governments and some states would rather collect a permit fee than turn down a billboard application.

There are exceptions. New York is fairly strict about billboards; six states ban them altogether. But in other states, billboard owners who want unobstructed views of their signs receive state funds to chop down the very trees that were planted with federal beautification money!

A 1978 amendment is especially onerous. Until then, the federal law had applied only to rural roadsides; local governments could enforce local billboard ordinances and remove boards without paying compensation. But billboard lobbyists convinced Congress that cities and towns should also be required to pay for removal.

For cities like Seattle and Portland, Ore., that are trying to clean up their looks, the costs will run into the millions.

Enough! Congress ought to make up its mind. If it wants states and cities to wrestle with the problem, it should repeal the compensation requirements that tie the hands of local officials, and let them choose between clutter and scenery that gives pleasure and attracts tourists.

If Congress wants clutter-free highways—which it should—it ought to pass a tough law. No new billboards, period. Tax billboard owners, who use public highways for free access to a captive audience, to remove nonconforming signs. Penalize states that don't cooperate. And mean business.

[From the Evening Sun, Baltimore, MD, Jan. 11, 1985]

HIGHWAY BLIGHTIFICATION

A sad story of recent days was the one about billboards along U.S. highways. For some while, after passage of the 1965 Highway Beautification Act of Lyndon and Lady Bird Johnson, outdoors really did look better. Shrubs were planted, screens obscured the view of junkyards, the outdoor-advertising industry removed some of its billboards.

How things have changed. Separate reports from the General Accounting Office and the federal Transportation Department indicate that three times as many new billboards are going up as old ones disappear; that the very trees planted to make America beautiful again are being busily cut down, so drivers and passengers will have an uninterrupted view of the ads.

Since 1982, GAO notes, no money has been budgeted for highway beautification.

The cynical will say that the program was doomed from its start, when the outdoor-ad boys backed off the requisite 600 yards or so from the interstates and put up their offensive eyesores all over again, only bigger, to compensate for the distance.

The ingenuous will say that before long billboards won't seem so garish; you'll hardly see them for the air pollution.

[From the Oregonian, Portland, OR, Jan. 26, 1985]

SCENIC ROADS LOSING

Lady Bird Johnson's chief legacy, the beautification of America's highways, is being lost, eroded away by fund shortages,

bureaucratic cynicism and, not least, the 1978 Hyde amendment that made it more difficult to remove signs, even those blighting the views. Starch must be injected into the Federal Highway Administration, charged with enforcement, and the Congress must come up with legislation that is not a prisoner of the billboard industry. Also, greater support is needed for local efforts to clean up the blighted highways and streets of America.

In many states, more signs are going up than are coming down. Local jurisdictions, such as Portland and Multnomah County, are under constant pressure from the billboard owners. Communities are losing more battles than they are winning.

Two federal agencies, the General Accounting Office and the Transportation Department, have issued reports this month indicating that the Highway Beautification Act of 1965 that Mrs. Johnson sponsored, has failed to accomplish its goals of making highways more scenic and safer by removing advertising billboards.

Aesthetic values are being destroyed not only by the signs but by a policy that permits clearing of trees and vegetation along federal highways so nonconforming signs can be seen. Non-conforming signs were legal when the law was passed. To get rid of them, the government must buy them, and it has paid for 600,000, while some 200,000 remain. Illegal signs, which can be removed anytime, are also proliferating, and enforcement agencies are ignoring them.

In 1984, Congress and the administration lost their enthusiasm for the program, and no money was appropriated for removal of non-conforming signs. About \$427 million is needed to get rid of the remaining non-conforming signs. But money may not be the most important part of the problem. Signs are not always taken down even when they have been purchased.

A group called the Coalition for Scenic Beauty is lobbying for new legislation, it has stated, because the current laws are failing to meet original objectives to remove highway blight and prevent it from spreading.

A combination of legal loopholes, ineffective enforcement and congressional apathy is a greater contributor to the failure of the program than a lack of financing. In some areas, tough local zoning laws were getting the signs down, but passage of the act preempted these laws, so some communities have lost ground under the program.

In addition to pressuring Congress, the public needs to get behind local groups that have been waging the uphill battle. The Oregon Roadside Council has been in the arena since 1932. It fights billboards, monitors enforcement and has pinpointed what it considers about 100 illegal billboards in the Portland area.

[Eugene (OR) Register Guard, Jan. 23, 1985]

SCENIC POLLUTION PERSISTS

Some Oregon cities—Portland, for sure—still have a long way to go in controlling billboards and other forms of visual blight. But, as a state, Oregon has established reasonable controls over roadside advertising in the 20 years that have passed since Lady Bird Johnson pressured Congress into enacting the Highway Beautification Act.

Moreover, Eugene, Springfield and a number of other cities have adopted sign ordinances that contribute to their sightliness while still allowing merchants and other advertisers opportunities to attract the public eye. These cities have simply outlawed

garish, constantly escalating sign competitions.

Around the nation, however, highway beautification is in retreat, and new billboard jungles are sprouting in cities and suburbs with a rapidity that would amaze even Jack of the Beanstalk.

While states that fail to police signs along major highways stand to lose allocations of federal highway construction funds, the U.S. inspector general reports that the Transportation Department is "not aggressively pursuing the removal of illegal signs."

Since 1965, the federal government has provided almost \$200 million to compensate owners of 600,000 signs ordered removed from highway locations. But that investment is now being rendered next to worthless in parts of the country. The Transportation Department admits that new billboards are going up faster now than old ones are coming down. A General Accounting Office study is even more alarming. That study shows that during 1983 new signs were erected along America's roads and highways three times faster than old ones were torn down or relocated to more suitable sites.

Transportation officials say they haven't funds to deal with the problem. The inspector general and the GAO say that loopholes in the Highway Beautification Act need attention.

Congress should waste no time checking the facts and taking appropriate action. Federal budget problems may not allow aggressive attacks on illegally sited billboards, but the Transportation Department's priorities should be reviewed.

Beyond that, federal law could be changed to provide stiff penalties for owners who fail to meet firm deadlines for removing signs that haven't a legal leg to stand on. Such action would not only cut the costs of enforcing highway beautification. It also would stir interest in restoring and maintaining scenic values in communities where authorities are tolerating excessive signing because the public doesn't seem to care.

[From the San Antonio (TX) Express News, Jan. 14, 1985]

BILLBOARD LAW NEEDS REVISION

Imagine a federal program that paid a company to stop polluting in one place but allowed it to turn around and do the same nearby.

Now stop imagining and meet the highway beautification program. This legacy of Lady Bird Johnson's initiative may be the best thing that ever happened to the billboard industry, which some regard as being in the business of visual pollution.

While companies have been pocketing millions in federal dollars to remove offending signs, they simultaneously have erected even more signs elsewhere.

It wasn't supposed to work that way. Part of the problem lies in sheer neglect to enforce the law. But the law itself is flawed, too. It is full of loopholes that permit the billboard industry to conduct a shell game: Take one sign down here put up another there.

Two recent reports, by the Transportation Department and the General Accounting Office, spell out the magnitude of the failure. Nearly \$200 million has been spent in compensation for the removal of signs, but nearly \$500 million more would be required to take down the remaining billboards.

Fortunately, not all is bleak in the world of billboard pollution. Six states have banned billboards. Others have imposed

stringent size and placement standards. Many local governments have done their part, too.

Given the confused state of the law, it's wise the Reagan administration hasn't asked for money for the program since 1982. If more is to be spent, a moratorium is needed on highway billboard construction.

Perhaps the best recommendation comes from the Transportation Department: Scrap the compensation program and adjust the law so that states can require the removal of signs after owners have amortized their cost.

[From the Lapeer (MI) Press, Sept. 18, 1985]

KEEPING HIGHWAY FREE OF BILLBOARDS

The new I-69 freeway from Lapeer to Port Huron is a beautiful highway of pleasing curves, rolling hills and trim farmland. But already it is being defaced by billboards.

Attica Township is small and rural, but it's fighting this billboard blight. When a sign went up last month, township officials traced its ownership to Gannett Outdoor Advertising and started proceedings. Gannett had failed to get a township building permit.

Gannett is a nationwide advertising firm, a subsidiary of the nation's largest newspaper chain which recently bought the Detroit News. Their failure to get a permit was not the mistake of a small businessman unfamiliar with the law.

It's fair to suspect that Gannett figured that if they moved fast and got the sign up, it would probably stay there. That's how a lot of signs get placed.

We applaud Attica Township for its fast action, as well as Inlay Township where officials are also trying to prevent the blight. Let's save a beautiful highway.

[From the Milwaukee (WI) Journal, Jan. 19, 1985]

LET'S GIVE SCENERY A CHANCE

I think that I shall never see
A billboard lovely as a tree.
Indeed, unless the billboards fall,
I'll never see a tree at all.

—Ogden Nash.

Since Ogden Nash penned his lament more than 50 years ago, the billboard forest has become a jungle in some parts of the country. The advertising sign remains ubiquitous despite the Highway Beautification Act of 1965, which was designed to help the scenery compete with the hype along the nation's roadsides.

Twenty years after passage of the law championed by Lady Bird Johnson, nearly 120,000 "non-conforming" signs still clutter the highways, according to a report from the General Accounting Office. "Non-conforming" is a euphemism for billboards that were legal at the time the law was passed but are no more, because of size, spacing and other restrictions. In order to get rid of those signs, state governments (with 75% federal help) must compensate the owners.

Taxpayers have spent nearly \$200 million to vanish about 600,000 such signs, but new billboards have sprouted faster than the old ones have fallen. In some cases, billboard owners simply used the money they received for getting rid of one sign to put up another along the same highway.

In 1972, when Wisconsin began to implement the federal beautification law, our state had about 14,000 non-conforming billboards (more than in many other states).

Only about 2,700 of those have been removed.

What went wrong? For one thing, the federal money for billboard control has dried up, and an unduly restrictive state law prohibits Wisconsin from buying out old billboards without federal assistance. Thus, the sign control campaign here, as in most states, is at a virtual standstill.

In the present fiscal climate, Congress obviously is not about to appropriate the estimated \$427 million it would cost to get rid of offending signs. The lawmakers could at least restore local governments' powers to stem billboard blight through zoning—a right that was effectively denied by a 1978 amendment.

Of course, there are more pressing environmental causes than billboard control. But "visual pollution," in the form of billboards, is one environmental abuse that could be rather easily controlled. Congress should not begrudge local governments the right to deal with the problem.

Tourists, after all, are attracted by scenic vistas, not intrusive billboards. ●

ROWNY'S ARMS CONTROL COMMENTS: RIGHT ON TARGET

● Mr. QUAYLE. Mr. President, it is not often that something genuinely new is said or written about arms control. Just such a speech, however, was given April 17 by the Secretary of State's Special Advisor on Arms Control Matters, Ambassador Edward L. Rowny.

In his address, "Strategic Offense-Defense Mixes: The Impact on Arms Control," Ambassador Rowny made several important points that deserve the Senate's close attention. The first is that the West has too often assumed that offensive weapons and tactics can overwhelm defensive technologies. The consequences of this mistaken assumption have been untold suffering and misery.

The second is that technologies of precision guidance and discrimination are now available to make defenses against the most offensive weapons—ballistic missiles—possible and to make the substitution of the most destructive weapons—large-yield nuclear warheads—feasible.

Ambassador Rowny rightly notes that these developments make significant reductions in strategic nuclear weapons systems reasonable. He is quick to note, however, that they will require us to be more innovative in our formulation of arms proposals for conventional arms and space security.

In this regard, I was particularly pleased to see Ambassador Rowny endorse Albert Wohlstetter's space self-defense zones, which could enhance the survivability of our critical satellites.

Mr. President, Ambassador Rowny's speech of April 17, represents truly fresh thinking on arms control. In hopes that wider distribution of his speech will encourage a sounder understanding of these issues in the

Senate, I ask that the full text of the speech be printed in RECORD.

The text follows:

STRATEGIC OFFENSE-DEFENSE MIXES: THE IMPACT ON ARMS CONTROL

(Address by Ambassador Edward L. Rowny)

The history of offense-defense mixes in the strategy of warfare has been determined for the most part by technological advances. Moreover, the advent of new technology has tended to determine the strategy at any given time, rather than vice versa. This inevitably occurred at the expense of upsetting an existing mindset, a point often reflected in the notion that we always prepare to fight the last war. In this century, technology has fundamentally overturned prevailing notions about offensive-defensive mixes four times.

The first time occurred in 1914 when the belief in the offense epitomized by the Schlieffen plan died in the trenches in Belgium and Northern France. The promise of a quick and decisive victory with light casualties anticipated by the German general staff ultimately gave way to the more ghastly spectres of Flanders, the Somme and Verdun. The gridlock which characterized so much of the war of 1914-1918 was finally broken by new technology in the form of the tank. However, by that time, the heavy casualties had taken their enormous toll.

The second time a fundamental change occurred was in World War II. Horrified by the carnage which had caused virtually a whole generation to be lost in Britain and France during World War I, strategists like Guderian, Hart and Fuller looked for better ways to have a quick and decisive offensive without heavy casualties. The defensive Maginot line was out-flanked by offensive Blitzkrieg forces, using the newly developed mobility and firepower of mechanical vehicles and airplanes. But subsequently, the strategy turned toward attacks against "panacea" targets. It was believed that these vital nerve centers, if destroyed, would cause an entire system to fail catastrophically. Oil refineries, rail heads and ball bearing factories were typical examples of what Hart termed the indirect approach. It was tested first in Spain, then during World War II in Europe, and finally in the campaign against the industrial heartland of Japan. Yet, decisive victory with small losses based on this strategy proved once again to be elusive. Large casualties, mostly as a result of ground-force fighting occurred. The prospect of additional casualties were hanging over us if we were forced to invade Japan.

The third time prevailing beliefs about offense versus defense were overturned by technology occurred in 1945 with the advent of atomic weapons. The atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki finally brought about the swift results strategists had been searching for. However, once the U.S. monopoly on the "absolute weapon" was broken, it quickly became apparent that the bomb had limited utility. Indeed, nuclear weapons were kept only to deter. The late Herman Kahn termed this: "The irony of the deterrent kept that it may never be used." Nuclear weapons were simply too destructive to use lest they invite retaliation in kind. Many different theories of deterrence have evolved in the post-World War II era. But central to the most widely-accepted ones is the notion that only nuclear weapons can hold an enemy's counterforce targets at risk.

The fourth technological revolution, which is now taking place, consists of three

parts. The first part is the noisy—some would say excessively noisy—revolution being brought about by SDI. The second, and more quiet part, is the one taking place in outer space. The third and equally quiet part of the technological revolution is taking place in conventional weapons.

SDI, if the research being presently undertaken proves feasible and cost-effective, will change our nuclear strategy from a purely offensive one to one of an offensive-defensive mix. Technology has now advanced to such a level that the utility of offensive forces, both nuclear and conventional, will be limited. I term this "pure defense," for as we envision it, it cannot be used offensively. SDI's aim, epitomized by the President's SDI Research Program, is ultimately to use non-nuclear technologies to counter attacking ballistic nuclear missiles at every stage of their flight path. SDI, in my opinion, will work and will prove cost-effective. The momentum of the program is being given impetus by the majority of scientists and industrialists, not only in the United States but in the United Kingdom, Germany, Japan, Italy and Israel. It is an idea whose time has come. It is, for the first time in modern history, an attempt to have strategy drive the use of technology.

However, this first success in modern times to change a mindset will not be easy. Aside from those who are comfortable with the current offensive nuclear strategy and are not convinced that an offensive-defense mix will be more stable, there remain two formidable problems. The first is managing the transition to a new strategy with our NATO allies so that decoupling does not take place. The other is managing the transition through the arms control process. I will have more to say on this last point later.

A relatively quiet technological change is taking place with high-tech in the field of outer space. Satellites have become an integral part of our terrestrial military operations. Moreover, our economic well-being has become increasingly dependent upon satellites. However, we have failed to realize that we must take steps to protect these assets. This could be done by "hardening" the satellites, by giving them "elusive" capabilities or by stationing redundant ones in space. Alternatively, we could plan on quickly replacing our lost satellites, or count on defeating attacks on our satellites with anti-satellites of our own. Satellites might also be protected in part through arms control agreements. But more on this later.

The final technological change now taking place is in the field of improvement of conventional weapons. In the first instance, better target acquisition, smart bombs, precision terrain-guided munitions, shaped charges, fuel-air explosives, kinetic energy and stealth, etc., will improve the effectiveness of current conventional forces. The improvement in tactical weapons will bring about changes in the offense-defense mix which are as yet highly unpredictable. The new SDI technologies related to pure defense, supplementing the technologies which apply to the sensible atmosphere (for purposes here defined as those under 300,000 feet), may lead to tactical missile defense in Europe. Along with other defensive changes the new technology may bring about, there will be transition in the strategy of defending Europe, quite aside from the transition which will be brought about through SDI.

Secondly, the advent of these new technologies further promises that current nu-

clear weapons can be replaced by strategic non-nuclear weapons. Non-nuclear weapons are less escalatory than nuclear weapons because they avoid the spread of radiation and collateral damage. Accordingly, strategic offensive forces may, in the future, include non-nuclear "strategic" weapons. Finally, the same technology which applies to non-nuclear strategic weapons can be applied to defense suppression.

Defense suppression is an area where conventional non-SDI-related high technology has much to offer. However, it is also the area that is driving the development of non-nuclear offensive strategic weapons. And herein lies the key. The same high technology can contribute to either pure offense or defense suppression. Indeed, it is possible to have conventional weapons which approximate "zero CEP" nuclear weapons, thus becoming counterforce-capable. This may well have been why Gorbachev expressed such anxiety in his January 15 statement about the development of conventional weapons of mass destruction. Let me reiterate that this includes smart bombs, PGMS, cruise missiles, Stealth and the like. Much different technology is involved in pure defense against a ballistic attack. Indeed, SDI is being deliberately structured so that it will examine technologies which have absolutely no offensive potential.

Defense suppression becomes of central importance in the offense-defense relationship because its effectiveness determines whether offensive forces become first-strike or second-strike capable. Moreover, we can envision how this will take place. Defenses can be overcome by speed, by saturation or by Stealth. These involve different high technologies, but all ones that we now know to be feasible and all ones that operate under 300,000 feet. In a world of both offenses and defenses, suppression of defenses below 300,000 feet would be necessary to assure the success of a second strike.

What are the implications of these technological changes for arms control? Agreements reducing strategic nuclear forces can be reached if only the political will is manifested. Agreements aimed at the protection of our satellites such as Wohlstetter's "self defense zones" would facilitate defense of space assets. However, there is little prospect that any agreement envisioned could, in the ultimate analysis, guarantee their protection. If research proves SDI feasible, there will be a need to jointly manage, through negotiations, the transition from the current offensive strategy to one based on an offense-defense mix. If agreements lead to the drastic reduction of offensive nuclear weapons, it will put greater demand on the need to negotiate conventional arms control agreements, lest the world be made "safe for conventional warfare." At the same time, agreements in conventional forces will become more complex. In this connection, the lack of success in MBFR, after a decade of negotiations, does little to inspire confidence that the arms control process can assist in the solution of this problem. But beyond this, the technological revolution in conventional arms will also require arms control negotiations to handle strategic non-nuclear forces and defense suppression forces. Otherwise, we will have done nothing to prevent what some analysts term a "strategic free market," at least for offenses and defenses under 300,000 feet.

Let me sum up the impact of the above on arms control. The problem of reducing strategic nuclear offensive forces, although up until now largely unsuccessful, is relatively

manageable. While the protection of our space assets might be assisted by arms control, agreements may never be able to fully guarantee their protection. This field of arms control needs to be developed. The nature of managing the transition from an offensive nuclear to an SDI environment is currently being formulated. Finally, the nature of the arms control problem of jointly managing and controlling newly emerging high-tech conventional forces will be very complex and difficult. Thinking on how to deal with this problem has yet to begin.

In the final analysis, one is naturally tempted to step back and ask if a world—not much unlike that of today—without defenses, wouldn't be more stable. Indeed, wouldn't it be nice to return to the "idyllic" days of the 1950s and 1960s? The answer is "perhaps," but only if we believe we could disinvest knowledge. However, technology itself suspends belief. This, however, need not work against arms control. On the contrary the technological "marketplace" will demand dialogue to efficiently allocate offensive-defense resources over the long haul. Thus, for the first time, we have the prospect of making technology our servant in the evolution of offense and defense, not our master.●

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

□ 1730

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair in his capacity as the Senator from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENTS IN BEHALF OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCONNELL).

The Chair on behalf of the Vice President, in accordance with 22 U.S.C. 276h-276k, as amended, appoints the following Senators members of the Senate delegation to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group Meeting during the 2d session of the 99th Congress to be held in Colorado Springs, CO, May 29 to June 2, 1986:

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] and the Senator from California [Mr. WILSON].

The Chair suggests the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

□ 1740

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXPLOSIVE MONETARY AND FISCAL POLICIES SURE TO BRING ON INFLATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in the judgment of this Senator the Federal Reserve Board has been following a highly inflationary monetary policy since 1982. Now, but wait a moment. How can that be? Inflation has moderated spectacularly since 1982, and in recent months producer prices have fallen and even consumer prices have started to actually come down in March and they are still falling. So how can any sane person look at the results and claim the Federal Reserve Board has followed inflationary policies? It is ridiculous.

What do I mean by inflationary policies followed by the Federal Reserve Board? I mean that the Fed has for the first time since we started keeping statistics in the present form increased the money supply far faster than the increase in the nominal gross national product. Now, why is that inflationary? It is inflationary because as the GNP increases in actual dollar terms, it requires a somewhat lower rate of increase in the supply of currency and checking accounts to finance that GNP dollar growth.

Now, since 1960, the money supply growth actually exceeded the dollar growth in the GNP in only 1 year, 1967. Even in that year the growth in money supply only slightly exceeded the rate of dollar GNP growth up until 1982. Now consider the 1982 through 1985 period. What a change. From 1982 through 1985, the money supply increase exceeded dollar GNP growth in 3 out of those years and in very, very large proportions.

So is this increase in the supply of money, an increase which is wholly within the control of the Federal Reserve Board, an inflationary policy? Well, it certainly is. There is, indeed, one crucial difference between the makeup of the money supply since late 1982 and the makeup of the money supply before that.

In December 1982, so-called NOW accounts or negotiated order of withdrawal checking accounts became legal nationally. What are NOW accounts? They are checking accounts that bear interest. Now, before the advent of NOW accounts, interest-bearing accounts were not counted as part of M1 or the prime measure of the money supply. Since 1982, NOW accounts have been. So what happens if we go back to the old system and omit all interest-bearing accounts from M1? What happens is that the relationship between the money supply and the gross national product goes right back to normal.

If we do that, the growth in dollar GNP continues to exceed the growth in the money supply. So if we exclude NOW accounts, it looks as if the Fed

has not been pursuing an inflationary monetary policy after all. If that is the way it looks, take another look. Ask yourself, when the Congress authorized NOW accounts and super NOW accounts so that all of us could earn interest on our checking accounts, did we simply convert our interest-bearing savings accounts into checking accounts that paid interest or did we convert our checking accounts into interest-bearing, check-writing NOW accounts? Which did most Americans do? No one knows; no one has made a study of it. But does it not make obvious good sense to reason that the checking account customer, particularly if that checking customer is at least a half-awake businessman, converted his checking account into an interest-bearing NOW account? Of course it does. And here is why. Most Americans have good sense especially when it comes to money. So most Americans with a checking account have likely put that idle checking account to work where it could both earn good hard cash and still serve as a handy deposit for paying bills. Except for those checking accounts that had been kept at a bare minimum and therefore did not add up to much of a sum, it seems logical that over the 3- to 4-year period since 1982 most of the fat checking accounts sitting around would have gone happily to work earning interest as well as providing a checking service.

On the other hand, why should a saver who has his money tucked away in a noncheck-writing savings account rush to move those savings over to a NOW or interest-paying checking account? Oh, sure, it might provide for a little more convenience, but surely the incentive to move noninterest-bearing checking account money into interest-bearing NOW accounts should greatly exceed the incentive to write checks on the savings account.

Now, having gone through all this, what does it all mean? It means that the present measure of the money supply including NOW accounts as checking accounts as part of M1 is right. And that means that the measure of the money supply reported by the Federal Reserve as M1 does accurately show the Fed has been pursuing an inflationary monetary policy for the past 4 years.

Now, that brings us right back to the initial contradiction. If this policy is so inflationary, why is it that it coincides precisely with the period of falling inflation culminating most recently in at least a short period of actual deflation, prices actually going down?

The answer is that for the past 4 years there has been a growing glut of commodities including food, oil, and virtually all other raw commodities. This has coincided with an excess of labor, with an unprecedented explosion of entrants into the labor market

in our country. This enormous increase in the supply of goods and the principal material for services, that is, labor, will run its course. Indeed, the falling oil prices may be ending already. Meanwhile, the unique, soaring rise of the money supply will eventually in a year or two begin a corresponding period of skyrocketing inflation. That reaction has always, always, in the experience of all countries, accompanies the kind of grossly irresponsible inflationary fiscal and monetary policy that this country has pursued for the past 4 years. It will just take a little patience to see it happen again.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOSCHWITZ). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 140 HELD AT THE DESK

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, after conferring with the Democratic leader, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Concurrent Resolution 140, designating June 6 as William C. Lee day, be held at the desk until close of business, Tuesday, May 20, 1986.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VIOLENCE IN SOUTH AFRICA

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I am just passing along a suggestion after talking to two or three of my colleagues. I think there is a feeling that with the violence that is taking place in South Africa and neighboring countries that somehow this body ought to be responding with something more than just words saying, "Naughty, naughty, this is not nice;" that we ought to be saying in concrete words to South Africa, "Your policy of institutional discrimination has to change." Not from a pious "we have all the answers and we have solved all our problems," as we know we have not solved all our problems.

The reality is we ought to be doing something a little more firmly and we are not doing it. I pass that along to the majority whip. Perhaps he can discuss it with the majority leader and with the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I will do the same with Senator PELL and Senator BYRD. It just seems to me we ought to be sending a message more briskly than we are now sending.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, knowing the Senator from Illinois, as I do, I sense his deep sensitivity and his

degree of social consciousness. All of us are offended and appalled by that situation. Indeed, his remarks, I believe, will perhaps galvanize us into some kind of method to work with the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator LUGAR, who has provided fine guidance in the past with issues from South Africa, along with Senator BYRD, who has worked hard in that area. I am sure they will direct that to the attention of the majority leader for action.

Mr. SIMON. I thank the Senator for that. I do not mean my remarks to be critical of the Foreign Relations Committee or anyone else, but I think what we see now as escalating violence will continue to escalate unless we can somehow get a peaceful resolution over there. I thank my colleague.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank my friend from Illinois very much.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY

RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that once the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until the hour of 10 a.m., on Tuesday, May 20, 1986.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF CERTAIN SENATORS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, following recognition of the two leaders under the standing order, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be recognized for not to exceed 5 minutes each for special orders: Senator HAWKINS, Senator GORTON, Senator CHAFEE, and Senator PROXMIRE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, following the special orders just identified, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed beyond the hour of 10:30 a.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for not more than 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, at the conclusion of routine morning business, it is the intention of the majority leader to begin consideration of the supplemental appropriations bill.

ORDER FOR RECESS BETWEEN 12 NOON AND 2 P.M.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess between the hours of 12 noon and 2 p.m. in order for the weekly party caucuses to meet on Tuesday, May 20, 1986.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, the distinguished acting Republican leader did not intend, I am

sure, to have as a part of the unanimous-consent request the expression of intention as to the consideration of the supplemental appropriations bill.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, that is known as part of the evening "rattling," and it was not my intention to do that. That was for information only. The Democratic leader is quite correct.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the distinguished Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, roll-call votes can be expected throughout the day, and the Senate could be asked to remain in session into the evening in order to make substantial progress on the supplemental appropriations bill.

At 2 p.m. it is the hope of the majority leader to lay aside the supplemental appropriation to resume S. 2180, and a vote is expected in relation to the Gorton amendment at approximately 2:30 p.m.

□ 1820

Mr. President, I believe that is the schedule, basically, for tomorrow.

I will ask the Democratic leader if he has further business.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] the acting Republican leader. I have nothing further.

RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW AT 10 A.M.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, after conferring with the Democratic leader, there being no further business, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 10 a.m., Tuesday, May 20, 1986.

The motion was agreed to and the Senate, at 6:18 p.m., recessed until Tuesday, May 20, 1986, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Secretary of the Senate May 16, 1986, under authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 1985:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Cynthia Shepard Perry, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipoten-

tiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Sierra Leone.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION OF THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

David Lowenthal, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 1992, vice Marcus Cohn, term expired.

U.S. POSTAL SERVICE

Crocker Nevin, of New York, to be a Governor of the U.S. Postal Service for the remainder of the term expiring December 8, 1992, vice Frieda Waldman.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1370:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. David M. Twomey, XXX-XX-XXXX U.S. Marine Corps.

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 19, 1986:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

George S. Dunlop, of North Carolina, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, vice Peter C. Myers.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

John W. Roberts, of Arizona, to be U.S. Marshal for the district of Arizona for the term of 4 years, reappointment.